

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 20, 1882.

The Week.

At the Stock Exchange, buoyancy and advancing prices were the characteristics of business, and, for the first time in over a year, the public at large were buyers in an important way of stocks the value of which is chiefly speculative. This indicates that after a year of poor crops and comparative depression, caused by the liquidation of the great speculation which followed the resumption of specie payments, the prevailing opinion is that the business of the country will now take a fresh start toward activity and prosperity. The crop news during the week has been of the best, and the indications are that, whether the Egyptian troubles spread or not, this country will have in the coming year the best foreign market for its exportable surplus that it has had for years. An event of the week was the enactment of the Bank Charter Bill, the main purpose of which was to extend the charters of the national banks with the least possible friction or disturbance. The bill was encumbered with several objectionable sections. One of these relates to the issue of gold and silver certificates, and compels the banks to sever their connection with any clearing-house which does not permit settlement of differences to be made in silver certificates. As the latter are not a full legal tender, and any one receiving them can only pay them to the Government for customs duties, and as the section relating to them is obscurely drawn, it is likely to fail of its purpose; but that there might be no apparent opposition of the New York banks to a law of Congress, the New York Clearing-house met and rescinded that part of its resolutions of 1879 which seemingly conflicted with the new law. Another section of the new law forbids the over-certification of checks, and was directed against a custom which all the banks having Stock Exchange accounts have safely practised for years. This action may lead to the establishment of a Clearing-house for Stock Exchange transactions; but for the present the banks "accept" checks, where before the custom was to "certify" them. The foreign demand for American securities has increased during the week, and none of the foreign markets have been unfavorably affected by what has occurred in Egypt. British Consols have been very firm, and have advanced slightly.

The appropriation of \$15,000 to enable the President to carry out the United States Statute relating to the selection of persons for the civil service, moved by Mr. Bayne in the House the other day, was contemptuously rejected, only five Republicans voting for it. Since then the eyes of the majority seem to have been opened by the comments elicited by this very remarkable performance, and on Thursday the appropriation was made by an almost equally large majority. The contempt of a considerable body of Republican legislators for the law of the land seems, in fact, to

be fully as great as for civil-service reform and party professions thereon. Here is the statute, passed as long ago as 1871, which they have of late been deliberately and insolently refusing to give the President the means of executing:

"The President is authorized to prescribe such regulations for the admission of persons into the civil service of the United States as may best promote the efficiency thereof, and ascertain the fitness of each candidate in respect to age, health, character, knowledge, and ability for the branch of the service in which he seeks to enter; and for this purpose he may employ suitable persons to conduct such inquiries, and may prescribe their duties and establish regulations for the conduct of persons who may receive appointments in the civil service."

The Pennsylvania Independents have promptly declined to be caught in the trap set for them by Mr. Cameron. At the same time they have deprived the Stalwarts of the political ground the latter expected to make out of an unconditional rejection of their proposition for reunion, by submitting a counter proposition which had the merit of fairness and was put forth as an ultimatum. It was to the effect that both the Stalwart and Independent tickets should be withdrawn, and that the several candidates should "pledge themselves not to accept any subsequent nomination by the proposed new convention." This proposition was signed by four of the Independent candidates. It must be observed, however, that the mere withdrawal of the candidates on both sides, and the mere defeat of Mr. Cameron's effort to make General Beaver Governor of Pennsylvania, do not meet the programme of the Independent movement. If the whole thing were to end there, it would fall very much short of the requirements of the times. Those requirements have been far more broadly and correctly appreciated by Mr. McMichael, the Independent candidate for Congressman-at-large, who refused to subscribe to the proposition signed by his fellow-candidates, and wrote a separate letter, in which he defined his position and purposes as follows: "I will not withdraw or retire unless events hereafter give assurance that the necessary reform in the civil service shall be adopted, assessments made upon office-holders returned and not hereafter exacted, boss, machine, and spoils methods forever abandoned, and all our public offices, from United States Senators to the most unimportant officials, shall be filled only by honest and capable men, who will represent the people, and not attempt to dictate to or control them."

The Civil-Service Reform Association has replied to Mr. Hubbell's letter in a way which would cover anybody else with confusion. In his letter of June 22 he loudly demanded that a test case as to the legality of assessments on office-holders should be at once made up and tried. He "disdained to seek shelter behind any cover," and was ready for "any form of action in any tribunal." This challenge the Association accepted, and proposed to go before the Circuit Court without further delay. Mr. Hubbell, however, immediately backed

out, and expresses no further interest in a judicial decision. The Association replies to his argument, based on the "voluntary" character of the payments, by calling his attention to the fact that the statute prohibits all payments, whether voluntary or involuntary. Mr. Hubbell is, however, so entirely shameless as to be beyond the reach of argument. Nothing short of criminal proceedings is likely to have any effect upon his mind.

The altercation between Mr. Hewitt and Mr. Robeson in the House of Representatives on Monday is another symptom that the temper of that body has grown too ugly for useful discussion and good legislative work. The first attack made by Mr. Hewitt on Mr. Robeson was, no doubt, fully justified. It is no unusual thing for a Senator or Representative, when revising the stenographic report of his speech, to cut out surplusage and repetitions, or interpolate here and there sentences that may be necessary to the clearness or continuity of the argument. Such things are frequently done without being noticed or commented upon. But when the interpolation consists in a personal attack upon a member of the Senate or the House which appears in print in the *Congressional Record*, and thus goes before the people without having been pronounced on the floor, the case is different. The gross impropriety of such a proceeding is obvious, and it might be characterized even by a stronger term. This is the thing which Mr. Robeson had done, and Mr. Hewitt, when he found himself personally attacked in the printed report of Mr. Robeson's speech, while Mr. Robeson had not uttered a word of that attack on the floor, was perfectly justified in inviting the attention of the House to it, and in asking to have that part of Mr. Robeson's speech expunged from the record. But he would have done better not to permit himself to be betrayed into a personal altercation with that gentleman. Mr. Robeson's standing before the country has for a long time been such, and it has been recently so much impaired by what he called his "vindication," that a parliamentary tilt with him cannot be creditable to anybody.

Mr. Elmore's letter to Mr. Randall with regard to the *Crédit Industriel*, and the support given it by Mr. Blaine, contains one important bit of testimony, which shows very clearly the real object which lay behind all Mr. Blaine's South American diplomacy. At one of the interviews at the State Department, at which Mr. Randall and Mr. Elmore were present, the question, it seems, arose as to what the United States would do in case Chili should insist on taking territory. While they were talking, Mr. Blaine sent a messenger over to the Navy Department, and in a few minutes a memorandum was brought in, which he handed to his visitors. It proved to contain a list of the vessels which the United States then had in the Pacific. Mr. Randall said: "This is too small a force for any demonstra-

tion against Chili." Mr. Blaine replied that the force did not signify, as "they were quite sufficient to make Chili understand what she might expect."

There is a good deal of excitement in North Carolina over a proposal made by a negro named Harris to have a "joint discussion" with Governor Jarvis before the people of the State. The suggestion was audacious enough in itself, but was made more dreadful still by the fact that Harris sent his message to the Governor by a white man, who is said to have been during the war a "gallant Confederate soldier." According to the *Raleigh News*, Harris "claims" that the people are ready for absolute equality, but the *News* says he is mistaken; that they are willing to have equality, but not so much equality as this. Governor Jarvis, at any rate, is not ready for it, for with a great deal of quiet dignity he told the messenger that "he had no reply to make." As it takes two to make a joint discussion possible, the North Carolina whites have this matter entirely in their own hands. When such revolting proposals are made them, all they have to do is to refuse, and no joint discussions will ever take place. In a community so intelligent as North Carolina, quiet will undoubtedly be restored as soon as this is generally understood.

The trouble over Walt Whitman's 'Leaves of Grass' has reached Philadelphia, where the Society for the Suppression of Vice and Immorality are endeavoring to have its circulation through the mails stopped. On the other hand, the Reverend Mr. Morrow, a Methodist clergyman, has come to the rescue of the book, which he says is the result of a "theory" of the author on the subject of the true function of poetry, and, though "robust and virile," is not an obscene publication; and he defends the book in a discourse of considerable length. There are two observations to be made with regard to this—that the law for the protection of the mails cannot be enforced if the character of the literature circulated is inferred from the "theory" which the author gives out as the explanation of it. In law the theory is mainly inferred, like any other intent, from the publication itself, and the explanations of the author are of comparatively little value as evidence. Another point is that public discussion of the question at issue does not advance matters much, for the poems which the District-Attorney is asked to look after are so "robust and virile" that few newspapers have dared to publish them. For the public to make up its mind, it is necessary to see the poems, and a discussion without copious quotations is consequently barren. If Mr. Morrow will read to his congregation some of the verses which he defends, the pewholders will then be in a position to judge whether they want to hear anything further about the "theory." Any one who takes up the cudgels against Zola or Whitman is obviously handicapped unfairly unless their defender will give extracts. Motives of delicacy forbid quotations to those who think them very disgusting; but the be-

lievers in their "theories" need not feel any restraint.

There was a very diverting scene at the prayer-meeting in Plymouth Church on Friday when Mr. Beecher made some remarks on the year's work. Mr. Thomas G. Shearman, famous ten short years ago as Fisk and Gould's lawyer during the disgraceful prostitution of the courts in their behalf, for which Judge Barnard was afterward tried and convicted, was present and humorously accused his pastor of conservatism. Mr. Shearman, who was then as now a church-member in good and regular standing, had at that time one of the most robust consciences in the State of New York, which enabled him to engineer some of the worst legal outrages ever perpetrated, without winking. Mr. Beecher, therefore, who is his pastor and friend, evidently trusted to the shortness of the public memory—which, alas! is very short—when he told on Friday an anecdote of Mr. Shearman. He was so scrupulous, when he was a member of the Church, "that having been brought up a Baptist, and not believing in infant baptism, when it became his duty to record the baptism of children he came to Mr. Beecher and asked if he could conscientiously record such baptisms and become privy to them." We are copying the *Tribune's* report. Now, we greatly fear the advice the pastor gave in this very delicate case was the beginning of Brother Shearman's fall, for he was told, evasively and jesuitically, as it seems to us, that "he was a mere historian, and in recording facts was in no sense privy to their commission." We do not know in what year this solemn scene took place, but we cannot doubt that the violence which Mr. Shearman was then led, through his pastor's demoralizing suggestions, to do to his convictions about infant baptism, prepared him for that exceedingly paying but by no means scrupulous practice which he afterward carried on in Fisk's Opera House. Mr. Beecher has undoubtedly ruined one of the most sensitive things in the way of a moral sense ever produced on Long Island. Had Shearman retained his pristine conscience, he never could have borne even the approach of men holding such broad views about baptism, both infant and adult, as Fisk and Gould.

The last news from Egypt, though very confused, seems to indicate that Arabi Bey has still a small force—about five thousand men—with him outside Alexandria; but desertions from him are going on, and it is more than probable that if he has to move, his men will disperse, as the British have offered rations to those who return to their duty, and the Khedive has issued a proclamation ordering them to go home to their villages. This *débâcle* will be precipitated by the rapid arrival of troops from England, and probably also from France, as, according to the latest news, the French have consented to share with England the task of protecting the Canal. It is not probable that the troops in following Arabi's fortunes really looked forward to active service against European troops. The prospect which opened itself to them was the one which

brings about nearly all military revolts—that of reducing the Government to submission, getting rid of the European officials, and ruling the country in their own fashion. Mutineers are seldom long-headed politicians. The Conference has, it is reported, decided to ask the Sultan to send troops to restore order, but only for three, or at most six months. Whether his sovereign pride will permit him to interfere under these conditions remains to be seen. If he does, we may be sure it will be with a secret determination to stay as long as he can, and we shall probably witness again the process of bullying him into the performance of his contract, he all the while hoping for a quarrel over himself among the Powers. The situation is full of the seeds of future complications. The main hope of avoiding them must be based on the fear of them by which all the parties concerned seem to be agitated.

The instructions of his Government to Admiral Seymour were read in the House of Commons on Thursday, and do much to excuse his apparent supineness, and to account for Arabi's escape. They appear to have been based on the assumption that the fleet was simply assisting the Khedive in restoring his authority, and, therefore, was to do as little damage to his premises as possible. After the Admiral had silenced the forts, he was not to "dismantle them or disable the guns," but was to "open friendly communications with the Khedive," and land sailors and marines, "in concert with the Khedive," for "police purposes," and if any foreign men-of-war present wished to coöperate in these gentle and humane measures, they were to be invited to do so. Unfortunately there seems to have been no sort of relation between these instructions and the facts of the situation to which they were to be applied. They supposed the Khedive to have some sort of force at his command, which the British sailors and marines could strengthen. The fact was that he had no force but himself, was the next thing to a prisoner before the bombardment began, and actually a prisoner after it began. Coöperation with him, therefore, in any military sense, was impossible. Fleets and armies coöperate with other fleets and armies, and not with solitary middle-aged individuals. The order not to dismantle the forts, or disable their guns after silencing them, we do not well know how to characterize. Bombarding a fort with the concentrated fire of the most powerful artillery of modern times is so rough a proceeding, that a warning to the commanding officer to handle the fort tenderly after it has been silenced seems too naïf to be genuine, and yet genuine we suppose it is. The order that the sailors and marines, too, were to be landed as a police force only reveals still more plainly that the Ministry thought they were going to deal with an *émeute* and not with a war, but their thinking so was on its face absurd and unaccountable. Rioters do not hold forts, or if so, do not need to be expelled from them by a fleet of iron-clads. Certainly any rioters who stood a bombardment of many hours from a British fleet of the largest size ought not to be pursued by police, but by soldiers.

After these instructions, it is not surprising that Mr. Gladstone should have accounted for his failure to take precautions against the awful scenes which marked the evacuation, by saying that the "Government could not have anticipated them." If they thought their attack on the forts was merely a little police duty, their surprise was natural enough. What they have to explain is, however, their failure to consider that any operation which called for the guns of a whole fleet was war, and war on a considerable scale, and their failure to perceive that there can be such a thing as limited war—or war that is to be fierce in the morning and mild in the afternoon. The officer who resisted the fleet in the forts was, it was plain to be seen, a desperate, and reckless, and very ignorant man. None but the desperate, reckless, and very ignorant would have attempted such a feat with the means at his disposal. Moreover, his rule in Alexandria had been marked a month previously by a massacre of Christians which he took no pains to prevent; and this in time of peace. There was, therefore, every reason to fear that, if maddened by defeat, and driven from the city, he would permit or perpetrate similar crimes. This would have been true even if he were not an Oriental Mussulman—a kind of man which the Gladstone Ministry certainly, that almost rode into power on a wave of horror excited by the doings of the "unspeakable Turk" in Bulgaria, had no excuse for not understanding. The almost bestial ferocity which lies sleeping under even the most polished Mussulman exterior is, in fact, something of which no class of men in our day have had more experience than British officials, both civil and military.

The *Pull Mall Gazette* suggests that the true way to protect the Suez Canal is not by attempting the all but impossible task of guarding it from one end to the other, but by getting hold of the Government of Egypt. It has, in fact, to be protected by that now well-known rule of modern warfare, which bids you reduce the enemy's fortresses and take his capital by destroying his armies in the field. When there is no force outside of them left they fall inevitably. In like manner the way to secure the Canal is to destroy the power, whatever it be, which menaces it, or, in other words, to seize the Egyptian Government. This, we presume, the British will now do. It would show extraordinary incompetency or timidity if they allowed Arabi and his force to escape from the trap which he has deliberately prepared for himself and walked into. Much of the trouble has been due to their failure to convince Arabi at the outset that they would not permit him to set up as a dictator. Had he been told so in peremptory language six months ago, things would never have reached their present pass, and an enormous loss in property, to say nothing of the loss of life, would have been prevented.

Of course, after Arabi has been deposed, and order restored by England, the other Powers, and particularly France, will have

somehow to be satisfied. Now that the bombardment has taken place successfully, and England has got all the glory of it, there are some signs that the French are annoyed by the timidity of their own Ministry, and more or less with England, and that there will be some rough places in the negotiations for the final settlement. But these will undoubtedly be overcome without trouble, because the Gladstone Ministry is in no Jingo mood, and has no ulterior designs, although it almost certainly would not have entered into the joint control with France, and would not have told her to work her will with Tunis, as Lord Salisbury did. Thus far the military part of the enterprise has turned out most fortunately for the Cabinet. It has cleared them of the charge of timidity and irresolution which had begun to rest heavily upon them, and has put the British people in good humor with them; and these things they sorely needed.

The resignation of Mr. John Bright from the Cabinet on account of his conscientious objections to war, and to military meddling with foreign states, is probably as fitting and honorable a close as could come to a long and illustrious political career. For close it is, we greatly fear. He is over seventy, and is not robust, and could hardly have held any position in the present Ministry which was not, like the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster, a virtual sinecure. But he would have cast a shadow on some of the best years of his public life had he allowed himself to become in any way responsible for the extension of English influence at the cannon's mouth. A strictly defensive war he might have stomachied—though of this we are not quite sure; but a bombardment of the aggressive-defensive kind he could not connive at and remain the John Bright of the forty glorious years of English history in which he has played so great a part.

Lord Granville's expression of regret in the House of Lords that England should be compelled to "use force against the weak," apropos of the bombardment of the Egyptian forts, is a curious illustration of the way in which a certain kind of cant survives for indefinite periods the facts to which it owed its origin. Reluctance to attack the weak was a product of mediæval chivalry, and was cultivated in the days when fighting was considered a good thing in itself, and valued much for its spectacular effects. It lingers still in the duelling and boxing rules, which place the combatants as far as possible on terms of strict equality, and it every now and then comes up in attempts to justify misdirection of political sympathy, as when during our rebellion English Tories used to pretend that they sided with the South because it was the weaker party, and thought Captain Winslow acted unfairly because in the fight with the *Alabama* he protected his engines and boilers by hanging his chain cables over the side. But it has no place whatever in modern political ethics. Nations do not now fight for fun, or to show how brave they are. They fight to have their way about something. So far, too, from

regretting that an enemy is weak when they attack him, they openly rejoice in it. In fact, they try to weaken him, or wait till they think he is weak, before they attack him. Just as it is a fatal fault in a modern general not to be strongest at the point of collision with the enemy, it is a fatal fault in a modern statesman to go to war unless he has allies, or has some advantage over the enemy in numbers, or resources, or armament. Finally, it is nearly always the weak whom modern Powers go to war with. They seldom attack their match, and always do so with great reluctance. In fact, they consider it barbarous to do so. Their improved weapons are nearly always used against communities which do not possess them. All England's wars since 1815 have been against the very weak. She keeps Ireland because Ireland is weak, and holds India because the Hindoos are weak, and bullies Turkey because Turkey is weak. Weakness among nations has a touch of immorality about it, because national strength comes from national virtue. It is the product of industry, order, forethought, love of country, determination, and persistence. It is these things which make nations able to thrash the weak; it is the absence of them which prepares the weak for the thrashing. The fittest survive, even more surely among nations than among individuals.

The Sultan must be the most bewildered of all the actors in the Egyptian trouble. He finds all the Powers full of respect for his sovereign rights until he wants to enforce them, when they peremptorily forbid it. When he proposed, some months ago, to interfere in Egypt by sending his troops and iron-clads to Alexandria, France and England warned him that he must not attempt anything of the kind. Then they summoned a Conference at Constantinople to settle by European concert what should be done in Egypt, and invited him to be represented at it. But as some previous conferences have resulted in stripping him of territory, under pretence of making him stronger, he naturally declared that there was no need of a conference at all, and that if they held one, he would have nothing to do with it. The Conference, however, was held, and he probably supposed that it was really going to settle what should be done in Egypt. What then must have been his surprise to hear that while the Conference was still sitting England had begun proceedings in Egypt on her own account, and was fighting Arabi Bey without the slightest reference to what anybody else thought about it. He naturally supposed that this would be a good time to call attention to his "sovereign rights," and telegraphed to London to ask to have the bombardment stopped, because it was a serious violation of these sovereign rights to bombard one of his cities without notice to him. But Lord Granville made answer that the bombardment could not possibly be postponed, and that he must not give himself the least concern about his sovereign rights, as they would be scrupulously respected. This must lead him to inquire more seriously than ever before what his sovereign rights are. Whatever they are, they are evidently of no earthly use to him.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, July 12 to THURSDAY, July 18, 1882, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

In the Senate, on Wednesday, the consideration of the River and Harbor Bill was concluded. Mr. Morrill's amendment, providing that one-half of the money appropriated shall be expended before June 30, 1883, the remainder to be spent in the discretion of the Executive, was lost, by a vote of 16 to 45. The vote on the bill was then taken, and it resulted, yeas 39, nays 23.

The Internal-Revenue Bill came up in the Senate on Thursday, and the tariff debate began. One of the significant features was a high-tariff speech by Senator Voorhees, of Indiana, who, some time ago, was declaring for free trade. Senator Morgan also spoke, opposing the introduction of a subject for the consideration of which the Tariff Commission had been created. On Friday Senator Bayard made a speech, in which he pointed out in what respects the bill falls short of what a measure for the relief from burdensome taxation should be, under existing circumstances.

After a discussion lasting from 2 until 4:30 o'clock, the Senate on Saturday passed the one-hundred-million-dollar Pension Bill without objection.

A proviso has been added to the first section of the Internal-Revenue Bill, by the Senate Finance Committee, by which manufacturers of matches can remove them to warehouses under bond, after August 15, 1882, without attaching the stamps required by law.

During the debate in the House of Representatives on Wednesday afternoon, on the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill, which contains an appropriation of more than \$500 to pay one of the new stenographers, a bitter attack was made upon Speaker Keifer's summary and unjust removal of certain competent stenographers. The wrangle continued for about two hours. On Thursday an amendment, appropriating \$15,000 to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the civil-service-examination section of the Revised Statutes, was adopted by more than a two-thirds vote. The bill was then passed.

The House indulged in a long and unseemly wrangle, on Friday, over the bill making an appropriation for the expenses of President Garfield's sickness. Mr. Kasson, of Iowa, came to the rescue with a proposition to close the debate by unanimous consent. The Senate amendments were then voted down, and the items of compensation were passed substantially as originally recommended.

The House voted on Saturday to non-concur in every one of the 150 amendments made by the Senate to the River and Harbor Bill. The House will sustain the Committee of Commerce in its announced policy of reducing the aggregate of the bill by about \$2,000,000. The Committee expects to strike out the provisions of the bill making appropriations for surveys for the Hennepin Canal and the Delaware and Chesapeake Canal. The House also refused, on Saturday, to agree with the Senate amendments to the Legislative Bill in regard to the equalization of the pay of employees of the Senate and House.

On Monday the bill providing for a third grade of letter-carriers and for promotions was passed by the House. The Senate bill to provide additional industrial schools for Indian youths, and authorizing the use of unoccupied military barracks for such purposes, was also passed by the House.

An angry colloquy took place on Monday afternoon in the House, between Mr. Robeson, of New Jersey, and Mr. Hewitt, of New York. Mr. Hewitt rose to move to strike from the *Record* a part of Mr. Robeson's recent speech, which charged Mr. Hewitt with falsehood in making certain statements as to Mr. Robeson's actions. Mr. Robeson rose in great excitement and accused the member from New York of using still worse language than he himself had

employed. In the course of his remarks he again defended his administration of naval affairs. The angry dialogue was stopped by a point of order.

The House voted on Monday to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the old Post-office property in this city, for not less than \$600,000, at public auction.

The bill to enable national banks to extend their corporate existence has been approved by President Arthur and is now a law.

Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, is worse, and his death is looked for at any time.

Senator Joseph Brown, of Georgia, has given \$50,000 to the University of that State at Athens, the interest of which is to be used for educating poor young men.

Mr. Robert R. Randall has been permitted by the Foreign Affairs Committee to file a sworn statement, supplemental to his testimony in the Peruvian Investigation. In the statement he reaffirms that Mr. Blaine, when Secretary of State, not only countenanced but warmly approved the programme of the *Crédit Industriel*, which, to a certain extent, implied an American protectorate.

The Tariff Commission has issued a circular, inviting correspondence from all associations, corporations, and individuals interested in the subject of its inquiries, and desiring to furnish information or testimony for its consideration in the discharge of its duty.

The special Grand Jury of the Criminal Court of the District of Columbia was given its instructions by Judge Wylie on Wednesday, and straightway began the consideration of the new evidence in the Star-route cases. On Friday they entered the court-room and announced that they had considered the evidence presented to them and had found no indictments. They were then dismissed. On Thursday, Judge Wylie made an important decision, admitting evidence of matters anterior to the date of the conspiracy as set forth in the indictment.

Through Mr. George Bliss, its counsel, the Government has agreed to submit a part of the Salisbury and Parker Star-route cases to arbitration, the arbitrators to be Second Assistant Postmaster General Richard A. Elmer, Mr. George Bliss, or some one named by him, and Mr. Robert G. Ingersoll, or some one named by him. It is reported that the Government expects to secure the repayment of about \$150,000 by this arbitration, which could not be recovered in any other way, except by long litigation.

It is understood that the Civil-Service Reform Association, of this city, will endeavor to present, as soon as possible, to the United States Grand Jurors, the names of office-holders who have contributed to Mr. Jay Hubbell's campaign committee in violation of the statute against political assessments. The counsel for the Association have written another letter to Mr. Hubbell, in which they point out that he has failed to follow out his own proposal, that a test case be brought before a circuit court; and that the discussion as to whether the contribution is voluntary or not is legally of no consequence, as, in either case, payment is prohibited.

A meeting of the Republican State Central Committee of Pennsylvania was held in Philadelphia on Wednesday, nearly 100 members being present, for the purpose of taking steps to secure harmony in the party. The Regular candidates expressed, by letter, the desire to submit their claims to any test deemed wise by the Committee. The Chairman was then empowered to submit four propositions to the Independents, any one of which would be acceptable to the Regulars. The propositions are: That both tickets be submitted to the popular vote of the party at the primaries, the one securing the most votes to be the ticket of the whole party; that a ticket, open for any candidate, be selected by primary elections; that a new Convention, under the rules adopted by the Continental Conference of Stalwarts

and Independents, be called; that a new Convention be held under the rules adopted by the Republican Convention of May 10.

The Independent candidates held a conference in Philadelphia on Thursday, and declined to consider the four propositions. They then prepared an ultimatum to submit to the Regulars, which was signed by four of the five candidates on the ticket, the exception being Col. William McMichael, who is named for Congressman-at-large. The ultimatum sets forth that the Independents believe that the propositions of the Stalwarts would not secure the desired unification of the party, and declares that they will only compromise on the basis of the withdrawal of the candidates of each faction, and a pledge from the candidates that they will not accept renomination. Col. McMichael wrote a letter, in which he said that he would not withdraw "unless events hereafter shall give assurance that necessary reforms in the civil service shall be adopted; assessments made upon office-holders returned and not hereafter exacted; boss, machine, and spoils methods forever abandoned; and all our public offices shall be filled only by honest and capable men who will represent the people, and not attempt to dictate to or control them."

Chairman McKee, of the Independent Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania, has issued a call for the meeting of that body on July 27, to consider the four propositions of the Stalwarts, which the Independent candidates, speaking for themselves alone, rejected. It is believed that the Committee will also reject the propositions, and probably refuse to sanction the ultimatum of the four candidates.

At a meeting of the Democratic State Committee of Virginia, in Richmond, on Wednesday, it was agreed not to call a Convention to nominate a Congressman-at-large, nor to endorse any candidate for that position. This practically commits the Democrats to the candidacy of ex-Auditor John E. Massey, at one time a leader of the Readjusters, but now a personal enemy of Senator Mahone.

The Democratic Territorial Convention of Arizona, which met on Wednesday, condemned the Republican government of the Territory for quartering hostile Indians within its borders. They demand that the Indians be removed or disarmed and turned over to the War Department.

The National Educational Association and the American Institute of Instruction held their annual meetings at Saratoga last week.

The great iron-workers' strike is now over in the St. Louis district, and all the forges and mills are at work. The employees consented to resume work, under the Cincinnati agreement, until a settlement of the existing difficulties at Pittsburgh can be effected.

Fifty-one families of Russian refugees, who came to this country a few months ago, returned to Europe on Friday, having failed to get work.

Crop reports for the past week are more encouraging for the corn prospects in Illinois. The Kansas wheat crop has been harvested, and surpasses the estimates made by the State authorities. It is the largest ever harvested there.

A terrible storm passed over Texarkana, Arkansas, on Wednesday evening. Half an hour later a large brick building fell upon a neighboring saloon, burying more than two score of people in the ruins. Few of them were rescued alive.

It is stated in Washington that the bouquet which Mrs. Scoville endeavored to convey to Guiteau on the day preceding his execution has been analyzed, and that enough arsenic was found in it to kill several men. Mrs. Scoville emphatically denies that she poisoned the flowers. There is also an apparently well-founded belief in Washington that the body of Guiteau still rests in the grave under the floor of the United States Jail, and has not been removed to the Army Medical Museum.

General O. O. Howard, Superintendent of the West Point Military Academy, will be relieved by Col. Wesley Merritt.

Mrs. Lincoln, widow of the late President Lincoln, died in Springfield, Ill., at 8:15 o'clock on Sunday night. She had been ill for a long time. She was a member of an old Kentucky family, and was born in 1821. Her maiden name was Mary Todd. She was married to Abraham Lincoln in 1842, when he was an attorney of some prominence in Springfield.

Bishop Scott, senior Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, died at his home near Odessa, Delaware, on Thursday, at the age of eighty.

José Domingo, a Carlist exile from Spain, who settled in New Orleans forty years ago and accumulated a great fortune, died on Sunday, July 9. His will leaves the bulk of his wealth to ex-Secretary of the Navy William H. Hunt, now Minister to Russia. Domingo was an old friend and admirer of Mr. Hunt.

Lewis H. Redfield, one of the oldest printers and journalists in the country, died in Syracuse on Friday, at the age of eighty-nine.

FOREIGN.

After the first day's bombardment at Alexandria, Egypt, a quiet night was spent by the British fleet in the harbor. When Wednesday morning dawned, the wind was blowing strong, in the enemy's favor, and the sea was rough, causing the war ships to roll so violently as to interfere with the efficacy of the heavy guns. At 6:30 o'clock the order was given to load with common shell. The *Inflexible* and *Téméraire* opened fire on the Moncrieffe fort, which had been repaired during the night. Only a few shots had been fired, eliciting no response from the forts, when a flag of truce was seen displayed in the town, and a steamer approached the fleet, also showing a similar ensign. The signal was given to cease the cannonade. The *Bittern* was sent to communicate with the Egyptians. The Military Governor of Alexandria conducted the conversation for the Egyptians, and Lieutenant Lambton for the British. Lieutenant Lambton informed them that he had not come to offer conditions, but to receive proposals. He said, however, that Fort Mex must be occupied by English troops and Fort Marabout be destroyed. The Egyptians replied that the latter fort had already been deserted, but they would give no answer as to Fort Mex. The Military Governor made no proposals, and Lieutenant Lambton steamed back to the Admiral's ship, about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and informed him that the evident object of the flag of truce was to gain time. At 5 o'clock, the Egyptians having hauled down their flag of truce, the *Inflexible* fired a nine-inch shell at Fort Mex, which was very effective. A white flag was again hoisted, and Admiral Seymour sent a message to the Egyptians that he accepted the flag of truce, but that it would be the last truce to which he would agree. During the afternoon several large fires broke out in the town. The loss of life up to that time among the Egyptians was estimated at about 2,000.

During Wednesday night the conflagrations in the city were seen to be spreading rapidly. At daylight on Thursday a flag of truce was discovered flying on the Ras-el-Tin palace. Four of the British fleet then steamed into the inner harbor, under the white flag. The real meaning of the fruitless negotiations of the day before then became apparent. Arabi Pasha merely wanted time, and during the afternoon and night the whole civil population and Army had withdrawn, and were in full retreat toward the interior. Released convicts and lawless Bedouins remained behind for a few hours. A reign of terror ensued. The European quarter of the city was fired and sacked. Christians were banded together in many strong buildings for self-defence, but they were overpowered and massacred by hundreds. One band of a hundred succeeded

in fighting its way to the beach, whence the boats of the fleet removed them. The atrocities committed by the plunderers were terrible. The French Consulate was burned to the ground. Marines were landed by Admiral Seymour, with Gatling guns, to disperse the plunderers. The force was meagre and it had to proceed with great caution. There was some short, sharp fighting, but the Arabs continued looting the town until Friday noon. Admiral Seymour was informed that a large force of Egyptian soldiers were encamped outside the town, ready for attack. With his small force he could not be very aggressive, but the marines spiked a number of guns and held the Arsenal and Custom-house gates. Orders were given them to shoot plunderers on the spot, and the execution of the order had a good effect.

The Khedive was found safe in his palace. During the bombardment he was in great peril. Just before his flight, Arabi gave orders that the Khedive be murdered. A party of soldiers entered his apartment to commit the deed, but after long parleying their loyalty was bought by promises of money. They then escorted him to the Ras-el-Tin palace, and 700 British marines mounted guard. All the Ministry except Arabi Pasha presented themselves to the Khedive, and pledged their loyalty. He immediately took measures to reestablish order, with the assistance of the cavalry and infantry guards who remained loyal to him. The leading Pashas were summoned to the palace, and the Khedive cooperated with Admiral Seymour. The American Admiral was requested to assist in restoring order, and he landed sixty marines, who shared in patrolling the streets. The fire raged during Friday, and two-thirds of the city was destroyed. It was learned that Arabi's forces had become greatly disorganized, two-thirds of them having deserted during the bombardment. Arabi himself, it was said, had fled from the city by a boat on the canal, but his whereabouts was unknown. By 11 o'clock on Friday night the fire had ceased to spread, and nearly all plundering had ended. The English Consulate and the quarter containing the great grain and cotton stores were not burned.

On Saturday confidence was so restored among the people that cafés and shops began to reopen. It was possible to walk the streets without a military escort. The day was spent by Admiral Seymour in organizing a police force. Thirteen hundred Christian refugees were discovered who had been saved in a Coptic church during the massacre.

Admiral Seymour issued a manifesto on Monday, announcing that he had undertaken, with the consent of the Egyptian Government, the restoration of order. Nobody was allowed to leave the town after sunset. The Admiral also made an offer of rations to such Egyptian soldiers as would return to allegiance to the Khedive. The total British force in Alexandria is now more than 6,000 men.

Arabi Pasha on Monday assumed a defiant attitude. He said in reply to a letter from the Khedive that he did not intend to make war, but as the Powers were determined to force an attack, he thought it better to fight at once. His army is strongly posted. He has issued a proclamation declaring that the Arabs must pay all taxes to him, and has appointed Ali Feima, a notorious Anglophobe, to the command of the Suez Canal. On Monday night the Khedive sent a messenger to Arabi with a formal dismissal of him from the Ministry. Arabi's army is now intensely discontented, and starving women and children surround it.

Monday night passed quietly in Alexandria. The fires in the city were all extinguished. The execution of three plunderers, during the day, in the Grand Square, had a good effect. On Tuesday native police were organized to act under the military police.

On Saturday, rioting broke out in Cairo, despite the endeavors of the authorities to maintain order.

In the House of Commons, on Thursday afternoon, the instructions to Admiral Seymour, which were as follows, were read: "That as soon as the opposition of the forts had ceased he should not dismantle them or disable the guns; that he should open friendly communications with the Khedive, and, in the absence of the native authorities from Alexandria, should land seamen or marines for police purposes, and that he should inform foreign commanders of these measures. The Admiral was also instructed to invite the Khedive to assert his authority in restoring order. The landing of a British force for police purposes was to be in concert with the Khedive or any native authority in Alexandria, and any of the European men-of-war were to be invited to cooperate." Protests were made from the Conservative benches against the feebleness of these instructions.

At Constantinople, the Conference of the Powers continued its sittings during the week. On Friday night the conclusion was reached that the Porte should be invited to send Turkish troops to Egypt to restore order and reestablish the Government. On Saturday an identical note to that effect was presented to the Porte. The conditions of Turkish intervention in Egypt are understood to be as follows: The occupation of Egypt is to be limited to three months, at the expiration of which the Khedive can demand a prolongation. The cost is to be defrayed by Egypt. No European Commissioners are to accompany the Turkish troops.

The French Cabinet has resolved, at the invitation of England, to protect the Suez Canal jointly with that country.

Secretary of State Frelinghuysen believes that the American residents at Alexandria have suffered no harm, as they are all on board the ships or in the interior.

It was announced in the House of Commons on Saturday that Mr. John Bright had resigned the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster and, consequently, his seat in the Cabinet. During all the discussion on the Egyptian crisis Mr. Bright had been absent from the House, and his resignation was generally expected, on account of the opinions he has uniformly held on the subject of war, and armed intervention in the affairs of other countries. The *London News*, commenting, said: "By resigning, Mr. Bright has been honorably true to the convictions of his whole life."

The royal assent was given to the Repression Bill on Wednesday afternoon. On Friday morning, sixteen counties in Ireland, eight cities, and four baronies were proclaimed under the Act.

The Arrears of Rent Bill was considered by the House of Commons in Committee on Wednesday afternoon. On Friday the first four clauses were adopted without division.

The weather in Ireland threatens the utter destruction of what promised to be one of the finest harvests ever reaped there. The heavy and almost incessant rain has laid low many flourishing fields. Potatoes have been seriously injured.

The body of the Scotch Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, which was stolen some months ago from the family vault at Danacht House, Aberdeenshire, was found, on Tuesday, in the grounds of the House. A man suspected of connection with the theft has been arrested.

An explosion of gas occurred on the Rue Louis Philippe, Paris, during a fire on Wednesday, by which twelve houses were destroyed, twenty persons killed, forty injured, and one hundred rendered homeless.

In Paris, on Thursday night, the new Hôtel de Ville was inaugurated with a grand banquet, which President Grévy attended. The old City Hall was destroyed by the Communists in 1871.

The Fête of the Bastille was celebrated in Paris and throughout France on Friday.

An epidemic of cholera has broken out at Hong Kong.

THE RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE EGYPTIAN QUESTION.

THE concern of the Egyptian people in the conflict between Great Britain and Arabi Bey and his mutinous troops, which has ended so disastrously at Alexandria, is after all the main point of interest for foreign bystanders. If Arabi had been heading a revolt of the taxpayers against being compelled by foreign force to pay an enormous debt to foreign money-lenders, contracted by a reckless, extravagant, and dethroned prince, the sympathies of the civilized world would have undoubtedly been his due. There is no warrant, either in international law or in sound policy, for going to war to compel governments, and especially despotic governments, to repay money borrowed from foreign speculators. All civilized governments have, at one time or another, either expressly or by implication, repudiated the notion that any man who chooses to invest in the public debt of a foreign country has a right to call on his government to enforce payment either of his principal or his interest. And it would be very bad policy indeed for any government to hold out to investors and money-dealers the hope of any such aid, for it would destroy all caution on their part in dealing with weak or semi-barbarous powers. It would furnish speculators with a kind of security they ought not to have, and cannot have without gross injustice to those who live by their own industry. To tax the latter for a war waged to extricate the former from ventures which they must have known were risky when they engaged in them, would be great injustice.

It is safe to say, too, that if there ever was a body to which the maxim *caveat emptor* ought to apply, it is the foreign holders of the bonds issued by the late Khedive. Any one who bought them without perceiving the gulf to which Ismail's extravagance was leading, richly deserved to lose his money. Any one who perceived it, but bought them just the same, deserved it still more richly. Consequently, if the interference of France and England with Egyptian finances was simply an attempt to save foreign bondholders from loss, and if the enforcement of their claims was visibly increasing the burdens of the unfortunate Egyptian taxpayer, there would be nothing to be said for it. In fact, as a movement, even in form, for their protection, there is little to be said for it.

But, fortunately, there is not the smallest foundation for the belief that it has made any difference for the worse to the taxpayer. There is not the smallest reason for believing that Ismail's foreign loans have had any influence in increasing the peasants' burdens. The rule of native Egyptian, as of all Mussulman finance, is very simple: it is to take everything visible the taxpayer has got beyond a bare livelihood. In Egypt, owing to the gentle, uncomplaining character of the fellah and the wonderful fertility of the soil, it has long been the custom to apply more pressure than is usual in Oriental countries. Before the establishment of the European Control not only did the amount of the taxes depend largely on the caprice of the col-

lector, but the fellah was flogged to make him pay. If there had been no foreign debt and no European Control, he would have been taxed and flogged just the same. There is no bottom to the maw of an Oriental court. The truth is, the European Control greatly improved his condition by making the amount of the taxes certain, by stopping torture in the collection, reducing the theft and corruption in the financial administration, and introducing a proper system of accountability.

This must be borne in mind, after admitting all that can be said against any foreign interference on behalf of foreign creditors, and against the undoubted impropriety of foisting on the Khedive, as the Control did, a large band of very highly-paid European officials. In fact, whatever may be said for Arabi's revolt, it cannot be said that it was in any sense an attempt at political revolution on behalf of the people. In so far as it was political at all, and not a mere military mutiny, it was a rising of office-holders who found themselves cut off from their usual "divvies" out of the huge corruption fund which the revenues of every Mussulman country compose. The feelings which animated him and his confederates were precisely those which would animate the Pashas at Constantinople if the receipt and disbursement of the taxes were taken out of their hands. They would grumble and curse, and declaim about "national independence," and, if they dared, would revolt, massacre, and pillage.

Behind the financial question there is, however, as far as England and France are concerned, a much weightier one, on the moral bearings of which it would be impossible to pass without going much further back than it is possible to go in a world in which life is so short, and all interests, individual as well as national, so complicated. An orderly and tranquil Egypt has become a political necessity to England, on account of the Canal. It has become a necessity to France on account of Algiers, and we do not think we are too charitable when we say that it was the desire of securing this which led them to overlook the obvious and well-settled objections to interference on behalf of foreign creditors. A return of the turbulent old Egypt, ruled by a succession of military adventurers, rent by *émutes*, massacres, and civil wars, and fanaticized by dervishes and "false prophets," is something to which we cannot ask them to submit without asking them also to cease caring, the one for her empire in India, and the other for her empire in Africa. To ask this is to engage in what is called an "academic discussion," which, however profitable it may be for moralists and speculators, is not the business of statesmen. We are the less disposed to ask it, too, at the moment when Europe, after six hundred years of horrors, has plainly begun to roll back the tide of Mussulman barbarism, which has converted so many of the fairest lands on the globe into wastes which no civilized man ever traverses without shame and indignation. In dealing with Mussulman patriots and statesmen, too, they are dealing with

savages like Arabi Bey, who, after amusing Western sympathizers with the jargon of transcendental politics, which they have acquired to perfection, are ready to slaughter a village full of women and children, as at Batak, in Bulgaria, or fire a great city and let cutthroats loose on the flying householders, as at Alexandria.

SAGES.

THE attempts made to explain the meaning of Mr. Conkling's speech at Utica are natural, but at the same time unsatisfactory. The *Herald's* Washington correspondent declares that in Washington, where the matter has been most carefully considered, his friends think that it means that he is going to run for Congress, and that the speech is a "back-handed blow" at the Republican party. This must mean that he is going to run either as a Democrat or as a Half-Breed, for he is not the man to deal back-handed blows at the party from which he expects the nomination; but the idea of Mr. Conkling going to Washington as a Judas is so painful that almost any other plausible explanation ought to be readily accepted by his friends.

We, therefore, venture to suggest that the true explanation of Mr. Conkling's speech is not that he is going to come out as a Judas, but that he is merely going to set up as a Sage. That there is an opening for a Sage in the party, and that he may really do the party much good, is evident to any one who will reflect for a moment on the origin and functions of Sages. The idea of the Sage in politics at present suggests to the mind a venerable man, who has had a long and active political career, but has retired to domestic life, and is spending his declining years in watching the struggles over the primaries and conventions which he no longer tries to fix, the slates that others must make up without help from him, and the platforms which younger and more energetic men must render as meaningless as he and his friends did the platforms of his day. He occasionally holds forth to the younger men, giving them his ideas on the progress of events and the probable future course of politics, and he is always listened to with great respect and attention, and his speech or interview is published in all the newspapers, and the announcement generally made, too, that the Sage is going to run either for Congress, for Governor, or the Presidency, which the Sage, however, never does. We have in this State, for example, three well-known Sages—Mr. Tilden, Mr. Weed, and Mr. Seymour. The South has its Sages in Jeff. Davis and Alexander H. Stephens. The belief that Mr. Tilden will return to public life is so deep rooted that not even the repeated admission by his friends that he is incapacitated by old age from anything of the sort, or as his enemies put it, that he is a "mummy," can prevent the chances of his nomination for high political office being canvassed every year or two. Mr. Seymour's plea of physical incapacity has scarcely relieved him from the danger of being forced into public life; and nothing short of two or three paralytic strokes or dementia can really be considered as guaranteeing a Sage against this sort of interference with his chosen occupation.

When we say that Mr. Conkling's speech shows that he wishes to become a Sage, we judge from internal as well as external evidence. A Sage's speech usually consists of three parts: in the first he dwells upon the great pleasure it gives every politician who has devoted himself to public life, far from the congenial scenes of his childhood and youth, to get back among his friends and acquaintances, and see the old familiar faces and grasp the honest old hands once more. Then he goes into some general consideration of the condition of the country and of parties, showing that progress is being made all the time, and that there is reason to look forward to the future with the cheerful anticipations that have been warranted by the experience of the past. The Sage is always something of a reformer, but by no means a doctrinaire or a theorist. He does not believe in any particular reform, but in a sort of great political law of progress, which carries the country on to a higher and higher pitch of prosperity every year, without the need of any individual effort at improvement or any noisy struggle. In the third place, the Sage, if he understands his business, turns to consider the dangers to which the country is exposed, and these he always finds consist in the habit of spending too much money. He therefore recommends frugality and economy, and usually congratulates his hearers that they at least are prudent and saving, however wasteful others may be. All these marks of the Sage we find in Mr. Conkling's speech. For twenty-two years, he said, he had been banished from Oneida County, but at last he had got back—got home, got back to Utica—and, as Mr. Conkling feelingly said, there is no place like home. "Time, with his frosty fingers, has silvered many a brow, and the turf and the snows have hidden all but the memory of many a friend who once bravely and gayly trod with us the pathway of life," but the survivors "come with a warm welcome to a private citizen having no claim on your regard, except his warm and abiding attachment to your interests and your homes; except his attachment to our beautiful city, and to the neighbors and friends to whom for long, long years he has owed so much. Under these circumstances, you will let me believe, without other thought, that your presence here means the personal kindness of valued neighbors and valued friends. It could mean nothing which would be prized so much, nothing which could be held in memory so long and so pleasantly."

After this comes the allusion to the country, which has attracted such widespread attention: "The old party issues have largely passed away—passed away, at least, as dividing party lines. We are in a period of peace and great prosperity, but let us not forget that prosperity often tests and tries the wisdom of nations and of men more even than adversity."

Then we have the warning voice raised on the subject of economy: "The tendency is to spending largely, the tendency in Government is to profuse, perhaps lavish, appropriations of the public money. In the affairs of Government, and in the affairs of business, unless I greatly mistake, the lesson, the need,

and the admonition of the hour is frugality, foresight, and care. We have more need of the brake than of steam in a good many ways just now." For Utica, however, the danger is less, because "Utica, I am glad to know, is prudently planning and saving up her sons' capital, energy, enterprise. Utica capital is building homes for labor and planting fields for labor here, going not so much as formerly for investment and for speculation far away. All this is well." This was the whole of the speech, and if these are not the words and thoughts of a Sage, and if they have not all been uttered before now by Samuel J. Tilden, Horatio Seymour, Thurlow Weed, Jefferson Davis, Alexander H. Stephens, and their fellow-Sages, not once but on many occasions, we are very much mistaken.

It is all the more meritorious in a Republican to become a Sage because it is not so easy as for a Democrat. The Democrats have inherited a great stock of gnomic wisdom from the "earlier and purer days" of the country relating to such matters as centralization, the three departments of government, "each independent within its own sphere," and the necessity of government being divorced from connection with private business, which Republicans care little or nothing about, and in which the history of the party prevents their taking much interest. This fact would probably make it very hard for many of the most eminent Republican leaders on retiring from politics to set up as Sages, much as they may some day like to do so. It is impossible to imagine Mr. Blaine as a Sage, or Mr. Robeson, or Senator Logan. It needs a man who has been generally looked upon not merely as a brilliant orator or dashing administrator, but as one accustomed to the expression of what is believed in political circles to be thought. Nothing the younger politician so admires in an older one as thought, provided it does not interfere with his regular pursuits, and the character in politics he most reveres is consequently the Sage. The Sage need not be a good man—neither Jefferson Davis, nor Mr. Tilden, nor Thurlow Weed is believed to be perfectly good; but he must be a deeply thoughtful man, and that Mr. Conkling should now in his retirement be preparing to think is a most significant fact. That no Sage should be able to do this without having it generally believed that he must be going to run for office, is one of the risks of the occupation which the true Sage cannot avoid, though it must sadden him.

THE SUSPENSION OF THE PARNELLITES.

LONDON, July 6, 1882.

THE Parliamentary crisis which had been for some time expected has just come, and for the moment passed. History never exactly repeats itself, and the circumstances of this obstruction and suspension have differed in several material points from those of the winter of 1881. On that occasion the Irish Opposition, numbering between thirty and forty members, had resisted the introduction of the Person and Property Protection Act by obstruction which was not only systematic, but open and undisguised, consisting in repeated motions for adjournment, on each of which every member spoke at the greatest possible length. This course was peremptorily

stopped, after a sitting of two days and two nights, by the Speaker's interposing and putting the question. Next day, men's minds being much excited both by this event and by the arrest of Mr. Davitt, the Parnellite party disobeyed the authority of the Chair, and were suspended one after another for so doing. This time the tactics of the Irish section have been more discreet. In resisting the progress through Committee of the Prevention of Crime Bill they have not used dilatory motions, but occupied themselves with devising an endless string of amendments, and discussing each of these at very great length. Of course such discussion necessarily involved a good deal of irrelevancy and repetition, but the subject is a wide one—everything relating to the condition of Ireland could, with a little skill, be dragged in and made to appear pertinent; and though a speaker may be called to order for wandering, or perhaps even for a wearisome iteration of what he has said before, a following speaker commits no breach of order when he repeats what his predecessor has said. The impatience and irritation of the English members continued to increase, not merely because they were tired of listening to dull and seemingly purposeless debates, but also because every now and then some terrible murder was reported from Ireland, with the invariable addition, "No clew to the perpetrators." This sense of double helplessness—helplessness in the presence of obstruction at Westminster, helplessness in the presence of crime in Ireland—worked on the passions of the English members till most of them became ready for anything which would break the toils in which they found themselves caught. The announcement that an all-night sitting would be held was welcomed as a sign that the end was near, and it was, as you know, on the morning after that all-night sitting that the Chairman of Committees, Dr. Lyon Playfair, reported sixteen members as guilty of obstruction, and in the evening of the same day nine members more, the persons reported being in both cases suspended forthwith, by a vote of the Committee and of the House, for the remainder of the sitting.

The details of the "scene," as the newspapers call it, you have probably read altogether. They were much less dramatic than those of last session, and have made a less profound impression in the country. That is naturally the case when a thing has happened before; it is an unfortunate result of these irregular and violent remedies for evils grown intolerable, that the remedy seems on every fresh occasion less irregular, and is resorted to more readily and lightly. No example could show more clearly the dangers of that excessive regard for established forms and unwillingness to reform them in proper time which has often been remarked among Englishmen. For the last ten years or so the defects of our Parliamentary procedure have become gross and patent, yet it has been found impossible until now to get them adequately dealt with. The consequence is that when systematic obstruction is resorted to, and public affairs become serious, extreme and exceptional measures have to be taken to overcome it, the adoption of which gives a far greater blow to the traditional respect for Parliament and its usages than a gentler cure, earlier applied, would have done. This has befallen us. We have had what critics call our second Parliamentary *coup d'état*. It has been received with less surprise, and less regret that it should have been necessary, than the first one, and a third will be still easier and still more probable. Another disagreeable result is the great bitterness which crises like this stir up in men's minds. The English members, including a large majority of Liberal as well as Tory members, had grown so angry and impa-

tient that when the explosion came, and they found themselves able to crush their opponents, they could hardly control themselves, and have not been since in any mood to listen fairly and calmly to argument. The clauses of the bill which remained to be discussed when the Irish members were suspended on July 1, were of secondary importance: the two sittings allotted to them were amply sufficient to dispose of them. But had they contained the most serious provisions, it would have been easy for the Government, had it so willed, to hurry them through a passionate House, which called only for swift action.

To prevent a recurrence of obstruction, and enable the remaining stages of the bill to be promptly despatched, the Government revived what are called the "urgency resolutions" of last session, by which the Speaker is armed with almost dictatorial powers for expediting business and closing discussion. They had often been asked to do so earlier, but feared that the Irish Opposition would consume as much time in discussing whether urgency should be granted as the passing of the bill itself would require. And this would no doubt have been the case but for the suspension of the twenty-five members, which showed Mr. Parnell's friends that such stringent measures might be taken as would render resistance hopeless. Accordingly, when urgency had been voted, most of them retired, announcing that they would take no further part in the debates on the bill. The ground alleged for this was the manner of the suspension, which is objected to as being an unfair and unexpected extension of the rule which permits the Speaker or Chairman to name a member guilty of obstruction. Here some of the persons named were not present, and had not been present for some hours; they had, therefore, no opportunity of defending themselves, and as the offence was past, they might have supposed it had been overlooked. The action of the Chairman is, therefore, impeached, and several notices have been given to have it condemned by the House—notice, however, for which time for discussion is not likely to be found. In defence of the Chairman, it is alleged that what he named and was entitled to name the offenders for, was not so much obstructing at any given moment as participation in a conspiracy to obstruct—a conspiracy whose purposes might be carried out equally well while some were absent taking rest and preparing themselves to return and support the others. Such an act, it is urged, is really worse than the isolated obstruction of a particular member. Is it to go unpunished? or is it to be punishable only when each member is caught in fulfilling his own part of the work, not at any time when the existence of the conspiracy has become apparent? Whatever conclusion public opinion may form, there is of course too strong a tendency to support the Chairman to make any direct censure on him possible. His task during these two months has been a very arduous and exhausting one, and has sometimes appeared likely to prove too much for his physical strength. Even, therefore, if he had not shown great fairness and courtesy in the general discharge of his duties, there would be a disposition to stand by him.

The conduct of the Irish Nationalist members through this long battle has been much blamed, and has no doubt increased the bitterness between the countries and the difficulty of establishing a *modus vivendi*. But Englishmen, as is natural, do not quite realize the difficulties in which these members were placed. A bill was brought in which, though no doubt aimed only at criminals, did subject ordinary citizens to

some—perhaps unavoidable—restrictions. It was, no doubt, an indignity to Ireland that it should be proposed, even if an indignity which the increase of undiscovered crime rendered necessary. If the Parnellite members were to retain their hold on their constituents, they must oppose it, and oppose it strenuously and untiringly. This the opinion of their own friends in Ireland demanded, and they had to choose between offending those friends, and being assailed as cowards or traitors, and irritating English members and incurring some Parliamentary penalties. Of course, they chose the latter alternative. But it may be asked whether they need have gone so far; whether it was necessary to carry resolute opposition into obstruction; whether, in defending what they think the national cause, they need have made so many personal attacks on English officials, and shown so constant a desire to insult England and all that belongs to her. They hold such behavior to be good policy, as hastening the creation of a separate Parliament for Ireland, but do not reflect that by making the English think that such a Parliament would be a wild and dangerous body they also impede their own plans. Be this as it may, any one can see how easily those who resolve to fight hard end by thinking every weapon and engine of warfare legitimate; and, after all, that is what their constituents expect from them. Y.

ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS ON INTERVENTION IN EGYPT.

LONDON, July 6, 1882.

THE existing state of journalistic opinion in England is so far an essential factor among the elements of the Egyptian question, on the eve of active European intervention, that it is worth while estimating it with some precision. At the present time there is a remarkable *consensus* of opinion among the leading journals, both Liberal and Conservative, though there are one or two noticeable exceptions. Even the *Times* is not out of harmony with its penny contemporaries, though it does its best, as usual, to preserve its balance of mind and not to commit itself too far for retracing its steps. The *Liberal Daily News*, the most conspicuous supporter of Mr. Gladstone's Government, after much vacillation, seems finally to have taken its side strongly against English intervention in any case; but its Egyptian correspondents all point in the other direction, and its articles on Egypt are just now little better than a cento of worn-out truisms on non-interference with patriotic movements in other countries. No attention is paid to the special facts and history of the case, or even to the evidence of the journal's own correspondents, who have demonstrated over and over again the imposture of the so-called "national movement." There is no paper of repute, on either side in politics, which writes with equal ignorance and weakness on this subject.

The *Pull Mall Gazette* and the *Spectator* are the Liberal organs which take the broadest and most intelligent views of Egyptian affairs, and of the proper attitude of England toward them. The *Spectator*, indeed, has for a long time past, and long before the present revolution in Egypt, consistently adhered to the view that England has a peculiar relation to Egypt which calls for and justifies its overwhelming political preponderance in that country. The *Pull Mall Gazette* has recently been engaged in a controversy with Mr. Frederic Harrison, who has made himself the mouthpiece of a society calling itself the "Anti-Aggression League," and which has adopted a most uncompromisingly pacific policy in reference to Egypt. The *Pull Mall Gazette*,

as edited by Mr. John Morley, is a strong supporter of Mr. Gladstone's Government, and, in fact, the disruption which generated its rival, the *St. James's Gazette*, was brought about by differences of opinion in respect to Lord Beaconsfield's energetic foreign policy. Nevertheless, the practical conclusions of the *Pull Mall* and the *St. James's Gazette* in favor of active intervention in Egypt are now identically the same, though, of course, supported by opposite classes of arguments.

It is indeed important to notice the very different considerations urged in the Liberal and in the Conservative journals which combine to support English intervention in Egypt. Conservative writers dwell most prominently on the imperilled honor and dignity of England; on the importance of the Suez Canal; on the traditional policy of the country; and, with some hesitation, on the claims of the bondholders. Of course they say nothing openly about annexing the country, and scarcely venture to hint even at temporary occupation. But their antecedents in Afghanistan and at the Cape have so discredited them in the constituencies that their Egyptian policy is looked upon somewhat askance. Nevertheless, they are doing their best, with Lord Salisbury's help, to turn the occasion to party account. They are holding rousing patriotic meetings, with the view, as they say, of "supporting" the Government, and, of course, without any party aims. Indeed, they deprecate the suggestion of making such a topic a party question. But Lord Salisbury and his friends lose no opportunity of reminding the Government of their "pledges," and "guarantees," and notes, and despatches, and of watching over the fulfilment of engagements with the most friendly, not to say officious, vigilance.

The more intelligent Liberal writers no doubt find themselves in considerable difficulties. The Liberals, with Mr. Gladstone at their head, turned out their predecessors, led by Lord Beaconsfield, on the question of non-annexation and non-aggression. No act of Lord Beaconsfield's Government was more severely commented upon and condemned in Liberal circles than the movement of Indian troops to Malta in order to bring pressure to bear on the enemies of Turkey. Indeed, it is said to have been on the very question of the proposed annexation of Egypt that Lord Beaconsfield's Ministry was, at one juncture in the Anglo-Turkish war, nearly breaking up. It now unluckily happens that the form to which all political and diplomatic events connected with Egypt tend is that of a European occupation mainly conducted by England. It is true, the English Government can establish by incontestable proofs that they have labored in season and out of season to come to terms with France in order to agree on a conjoint active policy; that they have encountered the evils and risk of any amount of delay for the purpose of bringing about active and effectual Turkish intervention; that they have exhausted the resources of diplomacy and international concert in the endeavor to have as many partners as possible in their enterprise; and that only when they found no one else willing and competent, they addressed themselves to the task of restoring and securing order in Egypt. This is all true, but it unfortunately takes much longer saying than repeating the commonplaces that all intervention is wrong, that nations should be left to govern themselves, that England should never have mixed itself up with Egypt, and that if Englishmen choose to live in Egypt, they must take what they get. But these commonplaces do not touch the Suez Canal problem, nor do they harmonize with the recognized Liberal policy of gradually cutting short the Turkish Empire and preventing any

province, which, like Egypt, has once escaped from the mire, ever wallowing in it again.

A.

FIFTY YEARS OF REFORM IN ENGLAND.

LONDON, June 29, 1882.

ON the 8th day of June, 1832, the great Reform Bill became the law of the land. Fifty years have passed since that date. We can now, therefore, form a fair judgment of the working and results of a measure which in the eyes both of its advocates and of its opponents constituted a turning-point in the history of England. Looking back from the vantage ground of half a century, we can see many things which were concealed from the view of the combatants in the great Parliamentary battle. The retrospect is curious. It is full of historical interest, but it also affords instruction quite as valuable for Americans as for Englishmen.

One point becomes to a candid observer as clear as day. The policy of 1832 has been as fully justified by its results as can be any act of statesmanship. The Whig leaders proved right both in their assertions and in their denials. They asserted that the reform of Parliament, the abolition of rotten boroughs, the making the representation of the people a reality, was to strike at the root of the evils from which England suffered. They based this assertion on their conviction that "reform" would afford the means and be the cause of every kind of political and social improvement. Who cares now to deny that this assertion was true, both in spirit and in letter? The emancipation of the West Indian slaves, the Factory Acts, the amendment of the Poor Law, the reform of municipal corporations, the mitigation of the criminal code, the foundation of a system of national education, the repeal of the Corn Laws—these and a host of minor improvements, such as the establishment of the penny post or the abolition of the press-gang, were all the more or less direct fruits of Parliamentary reform. But the indirect consequences of the change which identified the sentiment of Parliament with the sentiment of the bulk of the nation have been even greater, though less immediately notable than its obvious results. The policy of 1832 was at bottom a policy of conciliation. From that date to the present day English statesmanship has seriously attempted to reconcile every class of the nation by obliterating the distinctions or divisions caused by unjust or impolitic legislation. Churchmen and Dissenters, Protestants and Catholics, manufacturers and artisans, the Church and the people, have drawn nearer and nearer to one another, partly through the destruction of the legal barriers of privilege by which they were divided, partly through the spread of sentiments which were, so to speak, hemmed in by walls of legal and social difference. The work is not complete, it will not be completed for years. But no one who is not a confirmed pessimist can deny that a policy of justice, of humanity, and of sympathy has assuaged the bitter passions of class hatred which, by the universal testimony of persons belonging to every kind of religious or political school, distracted English society from, say, 1815 to 1850.

On this point I have dwelt before in my letters, and shall dwell again. Nothing appears to me to be of greater consequence than to realize the good effects produced in England by half a century of beneficent legislation. The Whigs were right in asserting that Parliamentary reform would be the source of improvement and prosperity. They were right also in denying that reform meant revolution. On this point the present generation hardly does justice either to the wisdom of Whig statesmanship, or to the apparent justification for the fears of Tories who

believed that 1832 would be to England what 1789 was to France—the beginning of an era of violence, of revolution, and ultimately of tyranny. Wellington, Canning, Peel, and hundreds of their now forgotten followers were men of parts and of courage. Their anticipations of disaster were based on the apparent lessons of history. The Tories of 1832 could many of them recollect the great French Revolution; they all of them had come to manhood during a period of reaction; they all of them had before their minds pictures of the Reign of Terror and of the despotism to which democratic violence gave birth. Lord Grey, Lord Althorp, and Lord John Russell were honorable men; but so were the Constitutionalists who hailed with delight the assembly of the States-General. When Bristol was in the hands of a mob, when Nottingham Castle was wrecked by the populace, when even moderate men talked about Hampden and the duty of refusing to pay the taxes, when the bull ring at Birmingham was crammed with hundreds of excited artisans who cheered Lord John Russell's denunciation of that "whisper of a faction" which ought to be overpowered by the voice of the nation, who can wonder that not only fanatics of Toryism like Wetherell and Croker, but calm administrators such as Wellington and Peel, believed that the "reformed Parliament" would herald in the rule of an English "Convention" doomed to inflict on the country all the horrors and calamities of a revolutionary era?

The Tories of 1832 were mistaken. Their error was natural. It is worth while to see wherein it consisted. Their mistake was, as we now can perceive, threefold. They underrated the self-control, the common sense, the political sagacity of their countrymen; they forgot the essential difference between Englishmen trained to public life by centuries of freedom and Frenchmen who knew so little of real politics as to take Rousseau and Plutarch for authorities in matters of government. They overrated the extent of popular discontent and disaffection. As experience proved, no class of Englishmen hated the existing state of society with half the intensity with which every class of Frenchmen detested the *ancien régime*. The Tories of 1832, lastly, underrated their own self-control and good sense. Under Peel's guidance, Toryism was transformed into Conservatism, and revolution was arrested because there was not even a beginning of reaction. Peel opposed reform, but Peel was indirectly at least as truly the author of the success which followed reform as he was of that policy of Catholic emancipation or of free trade for which he has, in popular tradition, received a credit that far more truly belongs in the one case to O'Connell and in the other to Cobden. When Peel announced that the Conservatives accepted the Reform Act, when Lord Russell had the wisdom to proclaim the "finality" for the moment of the change made in the constitution of Parliament, the policy of the Whigs received its real justification. By one of those odd turns of fate with which history is filled, the party which carried reform lost popularity from the very minute when reform triumphed, and this loss of popularity was, as we can now see, the surest proof that the policy of reform was sound. The wants of England had been met and satisfied, and the country, wishing neither for revolution nor for reaction, turned of necessity to the one consummate administrator who could make Parliament an instrument of good government. Peel was, in more respects than one, the agent who carried into effect the policy of the men whom he nominally opposed. If any one says, as some Conservative writers are inclined now to say, that the success of the Reform Act was due quite as

much to the moderation and temper of the Conservatives as to the energy of the Whigs, he says what in one sense is true; but those who credit the Tories of 1832 with the success of a measure opposed by every Tory from Wellington downward, must in fairness remember that the Whigs who predicted the success of reform ought to be credited with knowledge of the temper which the Tories were in the long run likely to show. To know, or rather to feel, that English noblemen would never fall into the mistakes of French *émigrés*, that Peel and his followers would never be disloyal to the Constitution established by law, was to perceive one of the most essential facts of the situation. If the Tories had as a body followed Eldon, Lyndhurst, or Croker along the path of reaction, reform might, it is likely enough, have ended in a revolutionary catastrophe.

The policy of 1832 has, in spite or perhaps because of its brilliant success, been the constant mark of severe criticism. It is worth while to examine with care the nature and worth of the most obvious objections brought against the Reform Bill.

Reform, it is alleged, has excluded from Parliament every man of genius who is not also a man of wealth or rank. The measure which improved the representative character of the House has lowered its intellectual ability. The elder Pitt, Burke, Canning, Macaulay, or Præd would not now find the field for his political talents. The large constituencies prefer tried politicians or local magnates, and have neither the wish nor the discrimination to encourage or patronize youthful genius. The facts alleged by the critics of reform are, I think, in the main true. I say "in the main," because it is not yet proved that a young man of great talents may not, even without wealth or political connections, win a seat in Parliament if he devotes himself to a political career with the same energy with which his friends labor for success at the bar or in literature. There is every reason to suppose that men like Mr. John Morley and Mr. Frederic Harrison, might, if they chose to give all their talents to politics, find constituencies capable of perceiving how valuable these talents might be to the popular cause. Professor Bryce's election for a London constituency outweighs a hundred lamentations over the alleged incapacity of artisans or shopkeepers to recognize character and ability. I may further add that ordinary electors are much less exacting than were the old patrons of boroughs. It was considered a matter of honor that a member who voted against the wishes of his patron should at once apply for the Chiltern Hundreds. All England would be indignant if the Birmingham Caucus (for which, I admit, I entertain no great admiration) were to imitate the noblemen who during the last century exacted from their nominees obedience to a "mandate" quite as "imperative" as any issued by French Democratic electors. The plain truth is, that if the system of rotten boroughs occasionally placed a young man of genius in Parliament, it gave him a seat on terms which made his presence in the House of Commons a doubtful benefit to the nation. Burke was the dependent of Lord Rockingham, and probably never wrote or spoke with perfect freedom until he ceased to sit in Parliament. Macaulay was of too robust a character to be dependent on any man, but he held his seat when he first entered the House at the will of Lord Lansdowne. Moreover, for one man of genius sent into Parliament by an enlightened patron to serve the public, we may safely reckon that there were ten who were nominated by the owner of a borough because they were fit tools to do his dirty work. Lord Shelburne was a

man of enlightenment. There was no person for whom he had a more genuine admiration than for Bentham; yet, though his lordship had four seats in his pocket, he could not spare one for the man of genius whom he himself termed the "Newton of legislation."

Moreover, the state of things which led the owners of boroughs to pick out youths of talent who were ready to serve as the rhetorical gladiators of a faction in the party conflict of the day, was, it may be suspected, in itself transitory. There were signs before 1832 that the rotten boroughs were becoming the property of rich men who used Parliamentary influence to promote mercantile speculations. The critics who look with regret on indefensible anomalies which occasionally produce some slight amount of practical advantage, always assume that a bad system would not, as time went on, have grown worse. No assumption is more baseless. Evil produces evil, corruption is the parent of corruption. If the unreformed Parliament could by any miracle have been kept unreformed up to the present day, we may be quite sure that the House of Commons of 1882 would have exhibited all the vices of the House of 1832 in an exaggerated and fully-developed form. The rotten boroughs would long ago have become the property of companies or of promoters. We know well enough what are the uses to which the votes of members who owed their seats to the chairman of a railway company would have been put. We may console ourselves for the possible loss which may be incurred through some unknown Burke being compelled to write for the press instead of addressing the House of Commons, by the reflection that we have escaped, at any rate to a certain extent, the risk of seeing the House crammed by men who represent nothing but the wishes of stock-jobbers or of directors. Even as it is, the influence of the money market on Parliament is fully as strong as is consistent with the interests of the public.

Under the working of the Reform Act, everything, it is sometimes said, has improved except English statesmanship. Our leading men lack the nerve, the decision, the courage of their fathers. Lord Palmerston was the last of the body of manly and stalwart statesmen nourished under the system which the Reform Act abolished. The statement is too vague to be very satisfactorily dealt with by argument. I am inclined myself to hold that it does contain an element, though a very slight element, of truth. Increase of knowledge, the general diffusion of sympathy, the democratic and humanitarian spirit of the age, lead in the affairs of public life sometimes to the reality and much more often to the appearance of weakness. Pitt carried through the Act of Union with a vigor which would hardly be exhibited by Mr. Gladstone or Sir Stafford Northcote. He was hampered by no squeamish scruples as to the mode in which he obtained a majority in the Irish Parliament. He did not perceive all the evil certain to result from defying popular opinion: he carried his measure. We now know that the mode in which the Union was achieved deprived an act in itself of sound policy of nearly all the benefits for the sake of which it was carried by a Parliamentary *coup d'état*. Vigor without knowledge has a fine appearance, but it generally leads to results at least as bad as those produced by humanity without strength. Grant, however, that the politicians of 1800 possessed qualities, good no less than bad, not to be found in their descendants. This concession goes but a very little way in condemnation of the Reform Act. The amendment in any system of representation can, of its very nature, accomplish at the best but one object. It may bring parliament into harmony with the nation;

it may to a certain extent facilitate the approach of men of genius to the service of the state; it may, in short, create a representative assembly which represents the feelings and the talents of the nation. No assembly—we may fairly say no government whatever—can by any device known to man rise much above the moral and intellectual level of the people from whom it springs. This general truth is specially true of representative government. A nation full of dishonesty, of incapacity, of lawlessness, cannot form a representative assembly filled with all human virtues. A people of knaves or cowards will assuredly elect a parliament of rogues and poltroons. The best that can be hoped for from constitutional mechanism is that it shall produce parliaments of members not markedly inferior to their electors.

The question to be asked with reference to the Reform Act is, not whether the *morale* of English statesmen has or has not changed during the last half century, but whether the House of Commons has fairly reproduced the virtues no less than the vices of the country. The answer cannot be doubtful. The humanity, the moderation, the general spirit of fairness which have on the whole characterized the last two generations of Englishmen, have in the main also characterized the English Parliaments which have sat since 1832. If these Parliaments lack something to be found in the unreformed House of Commons—and the truth of this hypothesis is by no means made out—the want arises not from the constitution of the electorate, but from the state of the English nation, or rather of that wider world of which England is after all but a part. I am no special admirer of our own time; the age has its fair share of special vices connected with two general phenomena of which I trust to write to you on some future occasion—namely, unlimited freedom of discussion and the gradual disintegration of beliefs. But to lay these faults to the charge of reform is scarcely less absurd than to attribute them to the rule of a Queen. In 1830 France reformed herself after her manner by the "three glorious days" of barricades. In 1832 England began to put her house in order by passing the Reform Act. Is it France or England which took the true path of permanent progress? Few of your readers will hesitate to affirm with me that the "glorious days" were at best but a generous error, while the Reform Act was a prudent step toward infinite improvement. If this be so, the act and its authors need no further apology against the attacks of critical ingenuity.

A. V. DICEY.

Correspondence.

LANDING OF THE PILGRIMS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: We of the old colony feel much honored, I am sure, that your journal should devote so much attention to the discussion of the true landing date of the Pilgrims at Plymouth. But we have some objections to urge to the view which you take. If I correctly understand the object of your elaborate editorial discussion of the subject on Thursday last, it is threefold—viz., to prove (1) that the design of the celebration of the 22d December has always been to commemorate the landing of the colonists from the *Mayflower*, and not from the shallop; (2) that that landing took place on the 22d December, old style; and (3) that in honor thereof the celebration has always taken place on the 22d December, *new style*.

You will pardon us, I hope, that we do not all of us see at once the harmony of these proposi-

tions, if true; while, as we doubt their truth, we hope your charity will be extended at least long enough to look candidly at the evidence to be presented on the other side.

1. Some of us deny that any landing took place from the *Mayflower* on the 22d December, old style. It so happens that, while a great deal of uncertainty surrounds the exact dates of the early events of the colony, no uncertainty at all attaches to those of that particular date; but there is, on the other hand, the most absolute certainty that no landing whatever then took place. Of course it is not necessary to inform the *Nation* that but two original authorities exist giving testimony upon the matter in question—viz., Bradford's 'Journal' (first printed in 1856), and what is commonly called Mourt's 'Relation' (1622), which in this part was really written also by Bradford. Nathaniel Morton, in his 'Memorial' (1669), and Prince in his 'Annals' (1733), made use of both; but even the latter omitted much, while no subsequent writer has so much as pretended to offer original testimony as to the subject. Bradford is, therefore, the sole witness. And what says he? In the 'History' he condenses so much as to say nothing at all on this point. But in the 'Relation,' after stating in detail that they arrived in Plymouth Harbor with the ship on Saturday, 16th December (of course all his dates are in old style); that on the 18th (Monday) an expedition "went a-land," and, after exploring all day, "went aboute againe" at night; that the party explored again on the 19th (Tuesday), and that on the 20th (Wednesday) they went ashore again, and, after careful examination of all the good spots they had seen, concluded, "by most voyces," to settle "on the maine land, on the first place, on an high ground" (Burial Hill and parts adjacent), where a part encamped, and the rest returned to the ship, intending all (who could work) to go ashore the next morning, he thus proceeds (p. 23)—viz.:

"The next morning being Thursday the 21. of December, it was stormie and wett, that we could not goe ashore, and those that [had] remained there [on shore] all night could doe nothing, but were wet, not having dai-light enough to make them a sufficient court of gard, to keep them dry. All that night it blew and rained extreame; it was so tempestuous that the Shallop could not goe on land so soone as was meet, for they had no victuals on land. About 11. a Clocke the shallop went off with much adoe with provision, but could not returne it blew so strong, and was such foul weather, that we were forced to let fall our Anchor, and ride with three Anchors an head."

Now please to notice what Bradford, at the time and on the spot, wrote as to the day when the *Nation* assures us that the whole *Mayflower* company landed on the rock:

"Friday the 22. the storme still continued, that we could not get a-land, nor they come to vs aboard."

Surely this is proof enough that, whenever the landing from the ship—if there were any—did occur, it was not on this day.

2. But, further, some of us deny that there ever was any "landing"—in the sense here put upon the word—from the *Mayflower* in the harbor of Plymouth. Without asking space here to establish it by citations, I hold myself ready to prove that what actually took place was this—viz.: that, as has been seen from citations already made, parties went from the ship on land to explore and to labor—after the first two days, a portion passing the nights upon the shore; that substantially this continued for at least a month; in all probability no female from the ship during all that time setting foot upon the shore; and that it was not until Wednesday, 21-31 March, that "the Carpenter that had bene long sick of the scurvey" was able ('Relation,' p. 35) to fit up the shallop "to

fetch all from aboard," and the ship was cleared, the whole company transferred, and the colonizing made complete.

But if no one comprehensive "landing" ever took place from the *Mayflower*, and if no communication was found possible between ship and shore, on the 22d December, old style, the hypothesis of the *Nation* seems badly to need readjustment.

3. A few words further touching the *Nation's* extraordinary idea that, since 1709, the posterity of the Pilgrims in Plymouth have been—with the exception of the last few years, when they have been observing the 21st—keeping the 22d December, *new style*, in memory of the fact that they have supposed their fathers to have landed there from the *Mayflower* on the 22d of December, *old style*.

In the first place, the descendants of the Pilgrims have long been sufficiently familiar with the facts of chronology to be aware that if they desired to honor the day which in 1620 was known to their fathers as the 22d of December, it would be needful for them to celebrate what in these days is accounted to be the first day of January.

But to us who have been all our lives studying this history on the ground, it is clear that nobody in Plymouth ever undertook to celebrate any event which was supposed to have taken place on the 22d of December, *old style*. What the Old Colony Club on 22d December, 1709, supposed itself to be especially commemorating was what happened in Plymouth harbor on the 11th December, 1620, *old style*. They made a mistake of one day, because in the *new-style* calculation, on which only seventeen years before they had entered, they were, as required by statute, adding *eleven* days to all previous dates of that century to bring the beginning and the end of it into chronological harmony; and it did not, at the moment, occur to them that the involved principle would require only ten days to be added for the previous century. But what they had in mind was the landing from the shallop, and not any imagined later landing from the ship. This will appear from careful examination of the records of the club; from Belknap's 'American Biography' (1798, ii., 204); from Thacher's 'History of Plymouth' (ed. 1832, pp. 179-198; ed. 1835, pp. 180-195); but more particularly from certain other testimonies. One is from the discourse delivered at one of the early celebrations (that of 1806) by the distinguished American annalist, Dr. Abiel Holmes, whose care and accuracy in regard to all such matters were second only to those of his master, Prince. He says ('Discourse,' etc., p. 16):

"There [on Clark's Island] they [the shallop's company] kept the Christian Sabbath. The day following [Monday, 11th Oct., O. S.], you remember it was [he was speaking to the antiquaries of the Old Colony], they sounded the harbor lying before us and came on shore. *The feet of the Pilgrims then first stepped on that rock, which your filial piety has sacredly preserved*; and which will be at once a memorial of the event and a monument of their honour to the latest generation."

That I do not misinterpret him here will be obvious from his 'American Annals' (i., 163, note), where he says, after speaking of the shallop landing:

"The 22d Dec., *new style*, corresponding to the 11th, *old style*, has long been observed at Plymouth, and occasionally at Boston, in commemoration of the Landing of the Pilgrims."

Judge Davis—than whom no learned antiquary ever had a more deserved celebrity—in his edition of Morton's 'Memorial' (1836, p. 48) bears the like testimony.

Is it asking too much most respectfully to request the *Nation* to adjust its historical judgments to these facts in the case—and the un-

named many which they sample—and not to lend the great influence of its assertion to the subversion of those faithful annals of the past toward which all true scholars are toiling, and as to which they may invoke its aid?

I have the honor to be, faithfully, yours,
HENRY M. DEXTER.

GREYSTONES, NEW BEDFORD, MASS., July 10, 1882.

[Our "view" of Forefathers' Day, as applied to the anniversary of the Landing of the Pilgrims in 1620, was expressed in these words: "Whether that disembarkation was made in one day, or occupied several days, is not so material. It is the idea of a general landing of men, women, and children that has made any one day remarkable; and the stream of literature sets in one plain direction—to the 'consecration' of the landing of the Pilgrims from the *Mayflower* on the 22d of December, 1620." And now, after a careful and candid study of the "evidence presented on the other side," we find nothing to shake that view, but, contrariwise, we find suggestions to strengthen it. Our correspondent asks us to "notice what Bradford, at the time and on the spot, wrote as to the day when the *Nation* assures us that the whole *Mayflower* party landed on the rock." And in return we must ask him to notice that the *Nation* did not "assure us that the whole *Mayflower* party landed on the rock" on the day named, and that it merely repeated the traditions of the landing as they were connected with Forefathers' Day. It is proper to state that the lines to which our attention is called are taken from that well-known work commonly entitled Mourt's 'Relation,' and that it is not absolutely certain that they were penned by Bradford. We are surprised that our correspondent should find it "clear that nobody in Plymouth ever undertook to celebrate any event which was supposed to have taken place on the 22d of December, *old style*." The article which has drawn out his communication furnishes evidence, as we believe, that the celebrants had in mind an event—to wit, the landing from the *Mayflower*—indicated by tradition as occurring on that very day. And we really doubt if even one in one thousand among those engaged from year to year in the celebration at Plymouth and elsewhere had any thought that the "shallop" landing on the 11th was in the remotest degree connected with the day which was commemorated.

"The descendants of the Pilgrims have long been sufficiently familiar with the facts of chronology to be aware that if they desired to honor the day which in 1620 was known to their fathers as the 22d of December, it would be needful for them to celebrate what in these days is accounted to be the first day of January." So says our correspondent, with admirable exactness. And yet, in his very next paragraph, he says that when they undertook to honor the day known to their fathers as the 11th of December "they made a mistake of one day"! The first settlers, most assuredly, were familiar with the facts of chronology; they were acquainted with the chronological styles, as well with the new as with the old. Their residence in Holland had necessarily made them familiar with both styles; doubtless they taught their children the lesson of difference—that with dates of the seventeenth

century it was ten days. The lesson endured from generation to generation. Prince's 'Chronological History of New England' (published in 1736) was a common book in the Old Colony. Twice on one page has Mr. Prince occasion to note the difference in date for events occurring in 1620, as (Part I., p. 68) "May 25, or June 4, N. S.," "May 31, or June 10, N. S." And under 1618 we find "December 10, or 20, N. S.," the very date of the Sunday in 1620 spent by the "shallop" party on Clark's Island. We regard as improbable the supposition that any mistake was made by the Old Colony Club in its first public celebration of the day of the landing, and as even more improbable the supposition that, if any mistake had been made, it could have stood for a twelvemonth uncorrected. If the descendants of the Pilgrims "desired to honor the day which in 1620 was known to their fathers as the 22d of December," they would have taken the day as it was marked in the calendar, without concern for new or old style. The act of Parliament for the correction of the calendar provided that certain feast-days, holidays, fast-days, meetings of assemblies, etc., etc., were to be kept and observed "on the same respective nominal days on which the same are now kept and observed." And so we find that the anniversary of the "Powder Plot" was marked for the 5th of November, and the "Restoration of King Charles" for the 29th of May, the same in the new as in the old-style calendars, with many other events "too numerous to mention." No change of "style" would have required a change of the date of Forefathers' Day.

The 11th of December, 1620, presents no event worthy of special observance. A very small minority of the immigrants, with a party of the ship's officers and sailors (after spending sixty hours on an island in the harbor of Plymouth, within gunshot of the main shore), "sound the harbor," "march into the land," and "return to the ship." Forefathers' Day, in the almost universal acceptance of the term, means something else. It presents for commemoration the Landing of the Pilgrims—the landing of men, women, and children—"landing from the *Mayflower* on the rock of Plymouth." Tradition has fixed upon the 22d of December, 1620, as the date of the landing; and if, in regard to that date, history and tradition run counter, the sentiment attaching to the 22d remains undisturbed. An extract from Palfrey is to the point: "The *twenty-second* day of December has taken a firm hold on the local thought and literature, which the *twenty-first* will scarcely displace."—ED. NATION.]

HOW TO STOP POLITICAL ASSESSMENTS. TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Abuses are never voluntarily given up by those who profit by them. Indulgences and dispensations were not abolished by the popes, nor absolute government by kings, nor slavery by slaveholders. The extortion of "free gifts" from a hundred thousand men, women, and boys, employed by the United States, will not be voluntarily abandoned by Jay Hubbell and his consorts. Abuses must either fall by attacks from the outside or they will stop when they become unprofitable. And here the friends of reform have got the better of the extortioners at last. They have succeeded in forcing Hubbell

to proclaim openly through the land that assessments have been laid by the Republican party committee for as many as sixteen years, and that not one person has ever been removed, or otherwise troubled, for failing to come to time with his "voluntary contribution." The Civil-Service Reform Association can do nothing better than to publish that letter in a hundred thousand printed copies, and send one to each officer and employee of the United States. That will, in Mr. Hubbell's classic phrase, tend to "confuse their minds" to such a degree that nobody will contribute at all.

If this is not sufficient to make assessments unprofitable, and thus to bring them to an end, I think that the wealthy and influential friends of decency in the methods of government ought to associate for the purpose of finding employment at once for any person who loses his employment in a Government office for failing to give a percentage of either his time or his wages to the bosses. But if such an association be deemed too costly an undertaking, I know of a cheaper method still—a pledge by all wealthy Republicans of the country who are not connected with the Machine, not to contribute a single copper to any electioneering fund, local or national, until this whole business of assessments is given up for good.—Respectfully,
L. N. D.
LOUISVILLE, KY., July 9, 1882.

THE "KAHAL" OF THE RUSSIAN JEWS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the April number of the *Century* a Mme. Ragozin undertook to justify the barbarous outrages which are being committed on the Jews in Russia on the ground that the Jews live under certain institutions which are endangering the life, health, and prosperity of the Christian subjects of the Czar. As the most abominable and most provoking of these institutions she designated the "Kahal," pointing it out as the particular, if not the principal, cause of the atrocious outbreaks against the Jews. That Mme. Ragozin has, with her ridiculous as well as malicious story of the terrible "Kahal," imposed alike on the editor of the *Century* and the American public, the following frank and simple declaration will prove. It is issued by the representatives of the Jewish congregations who were called to St. Petersburg in the spring of this year by the Imperial Government to advise in regard to the Jewish question, and has been published in the *Golos* and other Russian journals:

"By ukase of the Senate of May 21, 1786, it was prescribed that there should be established in every Jewish congregation a supervisory board of three to five persons under the Biblical title 'Kahal'—i. e., public meeting to equalize the taxes among the Russian Jews, and to see that they met their fiscal tax-obligations. By imperial ukase of December 9, 1844, the institution of the 'Kahal' was abolished everywhere except in Riga and some cities of Courland.

"In spite of this, however, the malicious calumny, that there exists among the Russian Jews a secret Kahal institution, which tries by various illegal means to sustain the exclusiveness and particularism of the Jews, and to aid them in the attainment of various aims hostile to the other classes of the population, is still persevered in.

"In the hope of putting an end to this wholly unfounded calumny, based exclusively on forged documents composed by a Jewish renegade, we, the undersigned, representatives of the different centres of the Jewish settlements in Russia, rabbis, members of ecclesiastical and synagogue administrations, etc., consider it a sacred duty, calling the Omniscient Lord to witness, to declare publicly, before all Russia, that there exists in the life of the Russian Jews neither a public nor secret Kahal institution, and that such an organization, and all the attributes assigned to it, are entirely foreign to the life of the Jews."

Will the *Century* please take notice of this

declaration, in justice to the Jews, on whom Mme. Ragozin's article was a gross libel?

ISMAR S. ELLISON.

BUFFALO, July 10, 1882.

Notes.

JANSEN, McCLURG & Co., Chicago, will publish, in two large volumes, 'The Military Telegraph during the Civil War in the United States,' by Wm. R. Plum, formerly an active member of the Telegraph Corps.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. announce that they will issue, by subscription, a fourth volume of Knight's 'American Mechanical Dictionary,' bringing this admirable work down to date.

'England, Picturesque and Descriptive,' by Joel Cook, the American Correspondent of the *London Times*, is in the press of Porter & Coates. The edition will be limited; the illustrations abundant enough; the size quarto.

The second edition of 'The Revolt of Man,' which appeared anonymously in 'the Leisure Hour Series' (Henry Holt & Co.), will bear the author's name, Walter Besant.

Dr. Robert Young, of Edinburgh, offered to buy of the assignees of the late American Book Exchange "the unauthorized and imperfect plates" of his 'Analytical Concordance.' The offer was not heeded, and a new edition has been printed from the plates in competition with the authorized edition published by Funk & Wagnalls. Dr. Young asks the coöperation of the American press in protecting him in his rights by giving publicity to these facts. The outrage of pirating cyclopædias and works of kindred magnitude and laboriousness cannot, indeed, be too strongly denounced.

Prof. George Ebers complains in *Das Magazin* that his 'Daughter of an Egyptian King' has been dramatized and is to be played at Detmold, without one word of consultation with him, although long passages are taken bodily from the romance and simply turned into verse. 'Uarda' has been represented at the Victoria Theatre in Berlin again without his knowledge, and very badly. Nor could a notice on the title-page of 'The Sisters' that the right to dramatize it was reserved save that story either from stage piracy. A petition for a change in the law which makes such treatment possible has already been sent to the Reichstag.

Under the title of 'Familiar Studies of Men and Books' (London: Chatto & Windus; New York: Scribner & Welford), Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson has gathered into a volume ten essays on men of letters—if John Knox may be called a man of letters. Mr. Stevenson's nationality makes his paper on Burns—intended as a corrective of Principal Shairp's monograph—as sympathetic as it is penetrating. To us the most interesting essays are those on Thoreau and Walt Whitman. The latter originally appeared in the *New Quarterly Magazine*, and was noticed at length in the *Nation*; it seems to us to be one of the few sane criticisms of this poet. Excellent also is a paper on Samuel Pepys. Among the other authors considered are Victor Hugo, Villon, and Charles of Orleans.

The shorter essays reprinted from the *Times* in Mr. James Payn's 'Some Private Views' (London: Chatto & Windus; New York: Scribner & Welford) will be new to most American readers, and two of them at least, on "Whist-players" and on "Invalid Literature," are quite in Mr. Payn's best manner; but those from the *Nineteenth Century* are more familiar, and will be remembered as having called forth much comment and discussion when they first appeared. They are all lively, and they could have been written only by a very clever man with a wide

knowledge of men and books. The examination of the pecuniary advantages of the literary calling, and of the average chance of a bright young man's success in it, is more pertinent to the rigid conditions of life in England than it is to our flexible society, in which both the physician and the lawyer hold higher social positions than in England, and in which the journalist has a recognized rank. The sequel to this essay, however, the discussion of the whole art of story-telling, with its bundle of practical hints for the 'prentice novelist, has a more than local value.

Mme. Th. Bentzon's translation of Mr. Aldrich's 'Queen of Sheba' is one of the latest volumes in the 'Collection Michel-Lévy,' which is the French equivalent for our cheap libraries, though the volumes are 12mos and are mostly copyright. They cost a franc and a quarter each.

In 1846 the French daily papers announced as soon to be performed a play by Victor Hugo on "Mazarin," but it has never been acted. It seems that four acts are written, and that the poet intends revising and completing the play shortly for publication, under the title of 'Les Jumeaux.'

'Voltaire: Bibliographie de ses Œuvres' is the title of a work by M. Georges Bengesco (Paris: Ed. Rouveyre et G. Blond; New York: F. W. Christern), which is to fill three volumes, now ready for the press, and which is to do for Voltaire what M. Paul Lacroix and M. Émile Picot have already done admirably for Molière and Corneille, and intend doing also for Lafontaine and Racine.

Every one who watches literature must have noticed the increasing frequency of the practice of adding bibliographies to lives of men and to other works, especially to treatises on scientific subjects. The custom has at last reached legislative bodies. *Polybiblion* points out that the *Journal Officiel* of May 11, in its "Documents parlementaires," gives (p. 1149) a "Bibliographie relative à la question du régime des boissons," and that a bibliography of works on the situation of the clergy had already appeared (p. 745) in a report of M. Corentin-Guyho on a proposed law concerning the clergy.

A new edition, in five volumes, of Thomas Bewick's 'Quadrupeds,' 'British Birds,' 'Æsop's Fables,' and posthumous 'Memoir,' is to be brought out at the instance of his surviving daughter Isabella (aged 92). It will be throughout of Newcastle manufacture, and will be printed, so far as the cuts are concerned, from the original blocks—the family treasure. But 650 copies will be printed. Bernard Quaritch is the publisher.

The Circular, just issued, of the Local Committee for the Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Montreal next month, informs the members of the Association that its sessions, beginning on August 23, will be held in the buildings of the McGill University. The Queen's Hall, University Street, will serve for the public evening meetings. The address of the retiring President, Prof. George J. Brush, of New Haven, will be given on the first evening of the session. On the second evening following, the President of the Association, Principal J. W. Dawson, of Montreal, will hold a reception in the new Peter Redpath Museum, which will then be formally opened. The customary excursions to neighboring places will be an agreeable feature of the coming meeting of the Association. Several eminent scientific men from abroad have already signified their intention to be present and take part in the sessions of the Association: among them Dr. William B. Carpenter, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Dr. Samuel Houghton, of Dublin, and Prof. A. Renard, of Brussels.

—The Philological Association had an interesting meeting at Cambridge last week—a substantial address from the retiring President, Prof. F. D. Allen, of Harvard University, on the University of Leyden; valuable papers from Prof. W. D. Whitney, whipping in erring Germans to true views of “surds and sonants” and “the origin of case-endings”; a capital paper of original research, by Dr. I. H. Hall, into the bibliography of the Greek New Testament as published in America; an interesting paper by Prof. W. B. Owen, of Lafayette College, on the influence of the Latin syntax on the Anglo-Saxon Gospels; and other papers on Greek, Latin, and Anglo-Saxon subjects. The Philological Society of England has asked the American Philological Association to unite with it in preparing a list of words in amended spelling, so that the “joint scheme might be put forth under the authority of the two chief philological bodies of the English-speaking world.” The invitation was favorably received, and a committee appointed, with power to act for the Association within the limits of former reports adopted by the Association. The committee consists of Prof. F. A. March, of Lafayette College; Prof. W. D. Whitney, of Yale College; Prof. F. J. Child, of Harvard; Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of Hartford; Prof. T. R. Lounsbury, of Yale; Prof. T. R. Price, of Columbia; and Prof. W. F. Allen, of the University of Wisconsin. The Spelling Reform Association held its sixth annual meeting in Sever Hall, Harvard University, immediately after the adjournment of the Philological Association. The convening members were mostly philologists. They were not very numerous, and they did not claim that anything very astonishing had been done during the past year. They thought, however, that there had been substantial progress. A league was started of persons agreeing to use simplified spelling, beginning with such amended words as are given in the dictionaries: *program, iland for island, sovrain for sovereign, rime for rhyme, ake for ache*, as in Worcester. Prof. Scott, of Columbia College, was appointed to prepare a list of such words. Prof. W. D. Whitney was the first signer of the League.

—The ‘Constitution, Standing Rules, and List of Officers and Members of the Philosophical Society of Washington, April, 1882,’ makes a large exhibit of membership, the total number enrolled being 246, of which 149 are active members. The scientific meetings of the Society are held bi-weekly in the Army Medical Museum, and the character and dignity of many of the papers presented (very often the results of the labors of scientists in the employ of the Government are embodied in papers read there for the first time) should suffice to warrant their initial publication in a series of memoirs, which, however, the Society would seem not to have the means of issuing. The only publication of the Society is its Bulletin, or Proceedings, in which only now and then is a paper published in full, being usually given by title simply, or in brief abstract. The officers of the Society are: President, William B. Taylor; Vice-Presidents, J. K. Barnes, J. E. Hilgard, J. C. Welling, J. J. Woodward; Treasurer, Cleveland Abbe; Secretaries, M. Baker, T. N. Gill.

—The *North American Review* for August contains an article by Mr. Archibald Forbes on the Army of the United States, in which the condition in life of the American soldier is contrasted with that of the English, to the disadvantage of the latter. The former gets better pay, better rations, and a better provision for retirement, and last, but not least, a better prison. According to Mr. Forbes, “over two per cent. of the actual enlisted strength of the American Army” are in

Fort Leavenworth prison, and it is by no means a bad place for a soldier who does not like military life. His hair is not shaved, as a British soldier’s would be; he has an airy barrack-room for quarters, far more comfortable than the tent or hut which he would probably be occupying with his company:—

“Here he has his bed from the first night, and the liberty of unrestrained conversation with his fellow-prisoners. His food is the liberal ration issued to the American soldier, better indeed than the ration which the latter eats in remote stations, and supplemented in season by the produce of the prison garden tilled by the prisoners themselves. He eats this food in the company of his fellows, in a spacious dining-hall, equipped in a fashion so civilized as would shame a British barrack-room. The labor to which he is put is some handicraft the practice of which meanwhile has a rational interest for him, and the converseance with which, acquired in prison, may furnish him with an honest livelihood when again he shall be a free man. He is treated in every way as a rational being, rather than, as is the case with a British military prisoner, as a dog that has misbehaved and that is ever watching for a chance to misbehave again. He is allowed an individual freedom of action that is simply startling to the British observer of him; said freedom of action complicated only by the outer wall and by the bullets in the rifles of the prison guard. Occasionally, although rarely, he ‘plays the fool,’ and declares that he will work no more. Still he is treated, not as the misbehaving dog, but as the normally rational being suffering under a temporary aberration. He is brought into the presence of the Governor, who ‘has a talk with him,’ pointing out to him the folly of his conduct, and the consequences thereof. Save in exceptional instances, this expedient restores him to reason; if it does not, a course of dark cell and bread and water produces the result, and he returns to the shoemaker’s shop or the smithy a wiser and probably a better man. By good conduct he can shorten considerably his term of confinement. When that expires, he goes out into the world supplied with a suit of decent clothes—for it is held cruelty to stamp him with a convict brand—the possessor of a small sum of money, and of a railway warrant for his conveyance to the place of his enlistment. Yet further to mark his rehabilitation, if his prison conduct has been exemplary, he receives a certificate that entitles him to reenlist in the Army, if he should have the inclination so to do.”

Most of the inmates are deserters, and considering the liberal inducements which the Government service holds out, it may be doubted, on Mr. Forbes’s showing, whether the régime at the Fort Leavenworth prison is not open to the charge of being a little too pleasant and comfortable, considered as a means of repressing the crime of desertion. It recalls a little too much the discipline of the famous brig on board of which every tar was furnished by the kind commander with a copy of the *Saturday Review*. Mr. Forbes considers that our Army is managed throughout with a stricter view to business principles than that of Great Britain, and cites many illustrations of the bad effect in the latter produced by “influence”; but surely “business principles” do not require that even an exemplary deserter should receive a certificate entitling him to reenlist, with a railroad pass to his place of original enlistment. Mr. Charles W. Elliott contributes a rather startling article on “Woman’s Work and Woman’s Wages,” in which he insists that much of the hardship which women suffer comes from their being “so ignorant as to believe that brain-work needs and should have high wages; hand-work small wages.” The poor things believe it, we suppose, because they are told so by the wicked men, who, as they still do most of the brain-work, have a sinister interest in keeping up this economic delusion as long as possible. The “cure,” according to Mr. Elliott, is that “the strong must care for and help the weak, the wise the foolish, the old the young, and the young the old, and if this does not come to pass, Christianity is a delusion, and Civilization a failure, and Society a ruin.”

—The Imperial Academy of Sciences, Vienna, announced in 1870 its intention of awarding a gold medal for every original discovery of a comet. The stimulus to the advancement of cometary astronomy resulting from these awards is well known. The Academy withdrew its offer in 1877, and the most calamitous outcome of the discontinuance appears to have been that Mr. H. H. Warner, of Rochester, should have considered himself called to establish a similar prize—after his own fashion, however, and chiefly as a pharmaceutical advertisement. Mr. Warner and his “consulting astronomer” have undergone such severity of ridicule in this matter that recently, after the distribution of a series of two-hundred-dollar prizes, a new scheme has been circulated, from which the objectionable features of business advertising are subtracted, but from which it is nevertheless apparent that Mr. Warner still retains somewhat of the proprietary right in comets and such like. Very possibly Mr. Warner thinks he has quite as much right to define all the conditions under which his award shall be made as to say who shall have his druggist-stuffs and who not; indeed, the one would seem to be to him about as much of a business barter as the other. But, as we may now credit him with a genuine wish for the furtherance of cometary astronomy, it seems as if he ought to know that the imposition of a condition restricting the announcement of discovery of a comet cannot be otherwise than fatal to his scheme. Very fortunately, however—and this Mr. Warner ignores—all this matter of the early announcement of cometary discoveries was long ago adjusted very perfectly, in the shape of an agreement among astronomers the world over that the collection and transmission of such immediate announcements should be confined to acknowledged centres. Obviously, the Smithsonian Institution is the only appropriate centre for this purpose in the United States; and the folly of insisting upon the diversion of these announcements from their wonted channel is already apparent from the fact that the announcements of discovery of some recent comets—despatched to Rochester by the discoverers in order to fulfil the conditions of Mr. Warner’s prize—never reached European astronomers at all. In point of fact, the only scientific condition which can be imposed with reference to the discovery of a new comet is simply that pertaining to the first observation—viz., that it be sufficiently precise to be serviceable in determining the elements of the comet’s orbit; the astronomer securing such observation being entitled to the award of whatever discovery prize there may be.

—It is a constantly fresh surprise that when there is a lion in the path he can be made to run away by so slight an expenditure of courage and energy. The catalogue of the British Museum has been a lion in the path for more than a quarter of a century; or, to change the metaphor, it has been an elephant on the hands of the Trustees; and yet when a man of enterprise became principal Librarian, it was found to have no greater staying qualities than Jumbo. How to print the Museum catalogue has been the standing question for discussion in literary journals, at library conventions, and when two or three bibliographers were gathered together. All the commonplaces about a printed catalogue being antiquated as soon as it is issued, about the enormous expense, much better put into books, about the necessity of finishing it before beginning to print, have been brought forward again and again, and the project has been long since abandoned by all reasonable people as hopeless. And yet the British Museum is to-day actually printing its catalogue on a very simple

and perfectly satisfactory plan. Formerly, when one of the volumes of the manuscript catalogue was too full to receive any further additions, it was sent to the binder, who repasted all the slips in such a way as to make three or four volumes out of one, with plenty of room for the insertion of new titles. For a time this was not unsatisfactory, but the result was rather alarming. The catalogue now fills nearly three thousand folio volumes. There is a limit to the capacity of the famous reading-room, and that limit seemed likely to be soon reached. Something evidently must be done. So physical considerations brought about what all the demands of all the learned all over the world might not have obtained. It was resolved to condense each volume, as soon as it was full, by printing it. The printed slips could be used as the foundation of a new series of volumes, and as titles take in type so much less room than they do in manuscript, the Museum might grow to quintuple its present size without its catalogue occupying more space than it does now. The advantage, also, of being able to set two or more copies of the catalogue before readers, so that two persons can consult the same part of the alphabet at once, is not to be despised. It was also determined to offer the printed copies to other libraries and scholars at a nominal price. For £3 a year one can get all that shall be printed during that time of one of the largest and most carefully catalogued libraries in the world. As about 2,800 pages were published last year, the price is certainly not high. It may, to be sure, be forty years before one will have the whole, and it will not then represent the library at any one stage of its existence. But the fact still remains that it will be the catalogue of an enormous collection of valuable books, a mine in which the bibliographer can delve for a lifetime. There is a man who has read the catalogue of the Bodleian Library, in four folio volumes, through twice. No doubt somebody has already begun the work of reading through the Museum catalogue, an occupation of truly endless delight. Cataloguers, too, in numberless libraries will get great comfort from it and abridge their own labors by using the investigations of the London laborers. No doubt when all the volumes are in type some means will be devised by which the additions shall be printed also in alphabetical order, and not as now (in the second series publishing by the Museum) in the helter-skelter order of annual accession.

—To the list of German periodicals devoted to Romance philology may now be added *Romanische Forschungen* ("Organ für romanische Sprachen und Mittellatein"), published by Karl Vollmöller. This new work will appear at irregular intervals, and the volume, consisting of four numbers, about two hundred and forty pages, will, for the present, cost fifteen marks. No other existing periodical in this field devotes any considerable space to the important subject of mediæval Latin, so necessary for the elucidation of many vexed questions. The present number contains an important article by O. Dietrich, on the repetitions in the Old-French *chansons de geste*, and the first instalment of a Latin text of the eighth century, a translation of Dioscorides. This text is full of interesting examples of phonetic changes, as for example, *cauculos* (for *calculos*), *esspecies*, *ispargis*, *decoptum* (for *decoctum*), etc. In addition to these, are valuable contributions to Spanish etymology and the correction of Provençal texts. The list of contributors and the articles promised for future numbers assure the success of this new venture, in connection with which we may mention another work, almost periodical in its nature, and belonging to the same department of study:

we refer to E. Stengel's 'Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie,' of which three parts have already appeared, containing the "Chanson de St. Alexis," and some shorter Old French poems of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, an Italian version of the "Chanson de geste Fierabras," and various contributions to the criticism of the French Carolingian epics. A supplement to the first volume, or number, has just appeared, which is of interest and value to all students of early French. The separately printed edition bears the title 'Wörterbuch der ältesten französischen Sprache' (Marburg, 1882). It is in reality a *Sprachschatz* to E. Koschwitz's 'Les plus Ancien Monuments de la Langue Française' (Heilbronn, 1880) and to the texts above mentioned. The glossary contains every word in the oldest French texts, with illustrative passages from later works; every form is given separately, and at the end are two appendices, one a list of the words used in assonance and rhyme, the other a conspectus of the words arranged according to classes and forms. This latter appendix is practically a grammar of the oldest French, with the advantage of showing every form.

—The eighth volume has just appeared of both the 'Théâtre de Campagne' and of 'Saynètes et Monologues' (New York: F. W. Christern), and for the first time in their career of rivalry the latter is better than the former. In the 'Théâtre de Campagne' are ten plays and five monologues; and of the whole fifteen only "Les Claqueurs," by M. Jacques Normand, is really first-rate; as acted by the two MM. Coquelin it was probably very amusing. Next in value are two monologues, "Le Violon," by M. Charles Cros, for a gentleman to recite, and "Le Rideau," by M. Eugène Verconsin, for a lady to act—we say to act, advisedly, for although there is only one part in M. Verconsin's little play, it is really a play and not merely a "piece" to "speak." In the latest volume of 'Saynètes et Monologues' the general average is higher, and "Ce Monsieur," by the writer who signs "Quatreilles," is more frankly comic than anything in the corresponding volume of the 'Théâtre de Campagne.' It cannot be denied that there has been a falling off in both series lately. Perhaps the vein is nearly exhausted. Two of the monologues in 'Saynètes et Monologues' deserve to be singled out: one is M. Truffier's poem, "Les Statues," and the other is M. Paul Arène's very comic soliloquy of a lover by the edge of a frog-pond under the mellow rays of a summer moon; this is called "Un Drame à Cernay."

—"No page of the history of any nation, however gloomy it be, is so destitute of value that that nation cannot draw from it valuable lessons; and Greece of the present day is politically disordered because she has ignored this truth." "Only when based upon local self-government can parliamentary government fulfil its appointed purpose: to assure the political freedom of a country." These are among the concluding sentences of a valuable essay on 'Public Law in Greece under the Turkish Domination' (Τὸ ἐν Ἑλλάδι Δημόσιον Δίκαιον ἐνὶ Τουρκοκρατίᾳ), by Nicholas Moschovaki, Assistant Professor in the University of Athens. This volume of 200 pages may be commended to those who are interested in Greece, as a careful study of the administration of that country under the Turks. The second part of the book seeks to explain by what means it came to pass that, even in the days of Turkish rule, the actual administration of many localities was entirely in the hands of Greeks. The author first takes up the Greek Church as a political influence, and, without representing the Church as worse or better than it really was, gives an interesting account of the Ecumenical

Patriarchate and its relations to the Sultan, the Fanariotes, and the Greek race. He quotes Mr. Finlay's saying, that the "only buttresses of modern Greek nationality are the Greek Government and orthodox Christianity." To these he would add a third: self-government in communities. Next follow graphic sketches of the best examples of local self-governments as they existed in various parts of the Peloponnesus (notably in Maina), in Northern Greece, and in the islands. Especially interesting is his account of the administration of Hydra, Spetzai, and Psara—those islands which rendered such noble service in the Greek Revolution. The administration of most of these communities was in the hands of certain leading families; the yearly or semi-annual meeting of all the citizens was held within or before the church, after divine service; the offices, with some exceptions, were held without compensation; the management of the public interests was, in many cases, most admirable.

—Unfortunately, on the establishment of the Greek kingdom, this attested capacity for local self-government was entirely ignored. Hence Otto, in spite of all his virtues, his love for Greece, his honest administration, was swept from the throne. Now Greece has a liberal constitution, but the administration is still centralized. The demarchs (mayors) and most of the inferior employees are responsible, not to the communities whom they serve, but to the central Government. The indispensable change is: that this responsibility be terminated, that local officials hold their positions as long as they obey the law, and that gradually the local communities reassume the rights and burdens with which they have become so unfamiliar that they no longer desire them. If, under the oppression of Turkish rule, what may fairly be called a system of local self-government could develop in many localities, why should it not reappear in these brighter times, if only its need is clearly felt? Every thoughtful book like this, which sets forth plainly that "who rules" is not so important as "how he rules," and that the tyranny of the majority is as really oppression as Turkish rule, is a pledge of a better state of things in Greece.

THE LONGFELLOW BIOGRAPHIES.

SEVEN Greek cities contended for the dead Homer; six American biographers are already contending for the dead Longfellow. The contestant cities could do little harm; but there is something unseemly in the spectacle of the warring biographers hovering, pen in hand, round the very death-bed of the great author, like the two medical students with their lancets around the affray in 'Pickwick.' The disclaimer so promptly issued by the children of Mr. Longfellow appeared none too soon, but it has not arrested the flood of books. *Dux femina facti*: a woman took the lead. And after Mrs. Blanche Roosevelt Tucker-Macchetta came Messrs. Kennedy and Underwood and Stoddard; while Messrs. Austin and Greene have already made their public announcements. Five of these six make the unhesitating assertion that their respective works were expressly favored and aided by the poet himself. If we are to credit their collective statements, we have, instead of the simple, manly, reticent Longfellow, whom we thought we knew, a most undesirable substitute; a man eager, above all others, to be discoursed upon and gossiped about. Each biographer seems deeply interested in at least one person besides Mr. Longfellow: the most conspicuous desire of each seems to be to prove that he himself stood nearest to his hero—to prove, in a word, that "Codlin is the friend, not Short." From

this characteristic Mr. Kennedy's book alone is to be excepted. So far as this attribute goes, it is entitled to bear upon its cover the proud, distinguishing inscription: "N.B. This book does not claim to have been authorized by the late Mr. Longfellow."

The sternest advocate of the equality of the sexes will admit that in the race after personal gossip a woman has a certain advantage. No one else can approach so near a man, beguile so winningly, note such minute details of demeanor, and claim with such sweet naïveté an intimacy so extreme. Mrs. Blanche Roosevelt Tucker-Macchetta—for, like the Vicar of Wakefield, we like to give the whole name—had many advantages as a biographer. Her name itself must have been an attraction to the many-languaged poet; it seemed to represent four different tongues, and to be a 'Poets and Poetry of Europe' in highly-condensed form. She also seems to be a much-travelled person: for her 'Home Life of Henry W. Longfellow' (New York: G. W. Carleton & Co.) includes on different pages the condensed guide-books—almost as interesting as Baedeker, and in much the same style—of half-a-dozen European towns. Then her profession may have also been an attraction. She had evidently seen much of the world, across the footlights, and could describe Italian artists and English earls. Above all, she had wished to play "Pandora," and the kindly old poet, naturally gratified at coming so near to being a dramatic author, received with all his wonted graciousness the aspirant after fame, and habitually addressed her as "Pandora," thus adding a classic name to her four modern ones. She, in turn, approached him very much as Bettine Brentano approached Goethe. She did not actually take a nap with her head on his shoulder, like the trustful German damsel—for she was too busy listening to his confidences—but she hovered constantly about him, and called him always "Dear Master." If she is to be taken literally, she won him by these devices to chat freely with her about the most sacred experiences of his life—experiences about which, as has been hitherto supposed, he always drew a veil. We will not be so discourteous as to assert that on this point the lady's memory or imagination may have deceived her, but we will say that on some smaller matters she is absolutely to be disbelieved. Professor Longfellow, no matter how many other languages he knew, was at least acquainted with the English tongue; and when she represents him as saying of a delineation of himself, "It is me, and I will never have another taken better than that" (page 13), she attributes to him at least two grammatical solecisms which the testimony of a thousand Pandoras would fail to establish. If so inaccurate in this, why should she be trustworthy in more important matters? It is a less evil to have Mr. Longfellow depicted as ungrammatical than as a weak and garrulous old man; and since we know the first charge to be false, why believe the other? The lady has, like her mythological namesake, opened a box containing all manner of evil things, but she has not left a ray of hope at the bottom. Her book is conceited, inaccurate, vulgar, and worthless.

It is an immense advantage to Mr. Stoddard that his book was preceded by that of Mrs. Tucker-Macchetta. He certainly shares some of her weaknesses; he claims authority from the poet himself; he calls him familiarly "Henry Wadsworth"; and he prints little puffs of himself and his wife. In these personalities, however, he is utterly distanced by the lady; yet he has grave faults of his own, and it must be remembered that he has a certain literary reputation to sustain, while she had none. His 'Henry Wadsworth Longfellow: a Medley in

Prose and Verse' (New York: G. W. Harlan & Co.) is, to speak frankly, one of the most creditable pieces of literary padding that we have ever encountered. To swell its proportions, the editor inserts an essay of his own, twelve pages long, on the different translations of Homer; a long discourse of his own, before Mr. Adler's Society, on the "Poetic Art"—neither of these having any direct relation with his subject, Longfellow; and adds an appendix of letters from persons, not very distinguished, mostly apologizing for having no information to give about Mr. Longfellow. He reprints, like the other editors, some of the genealogical lore collected by the Maine Historical Society; he reproduces the early poems which Mr. Longfellow had the discretion to leave behind; and he employs, without acknowledgment, the careful Longfellow bibliography of the *Literary World*. But there is scarcely a sign of original investigation in the book, except such was implied in "a half-hour's glance over early volumes of the *Knickerbocker Magazine*," and very little of original criticism; while there is sometimes a slovenly and almost defiant indifference to facts easily ascertained. A letter or two sent to Cambridge or Portland could easily have ascertained for the most indolent editor that Mr. Longfellow's first marriage took place in this country, not in Europe (p. 60); that the well-known jurist, Theophilus Parsons, is no longer living (p. 16); and that the supposed boyish poem by Longfellow, exhibited on his seventy-fifth birthday in Portland (p. 12), turned out to be only some verses by Rogers copied as a schoolboy exercise in penmanship. The same careless and slovenly tone, the same preponderance of the first person, prevails everywhere; and the book closes with ten pages of doggerel which were composed by Mr. Stoddard on the day of Mr. Longfellow's funeral, and which are entitled to no better epithet than maudlin.

As Mr. Stoddard gains by the comparison with Pandora, so does Mr. Underwood by comparing him with Mr. Stoddard. His 'Henry Wadsworth Longfellow: a Biographical Sketch' (Boston: Osgood) is open to plenty of criticism, but it may at least be affirmed of it that it is not an insult to the reader. It has, like the others, the defect of claiming to have been expressly authorized. It is called only a sketch, and the preface gives the impression that under other circumstances it would have been far more adequately finished, yet there is no essential difference in this respect between the present work and Mr. Underwood's previous book on Lowell. Both books are disfigured by the insertion of little head-lines, at short intervals, instead of any division into chapters; and this gives a peculiarly trivial and newspaper-like air to both. One constantly expects to meet with, "The Nestor of the shoe and leather business," as in Bartley Hubbard's editorials.

This peculiarity really does injustice to Mr. Underwood's book, which is honestly conceived and carried out in what seems to the author the best way. It shows some faithful labor and some assiduous criticism; but, unhappily, an air of commonplaceness enfeebles all the result, and a little comparison with the Lowell memoir reveals the essential weakness of both works. Here were two men, living on the same street of the same town, moving in the same circles, writing in the same periodicals, holding successively the same professorship in the same college. Yet there never were two men, thus parallel in life, who were more utterly different in temperament, habits, genius, and literary methods. Here is the test of a biographer; and we look in vain through Mr. Underwood's book for a single incisive sentence, a single vivid touch of personal delineation, which shall make it forever clear to

all beholders that the sitter for the one portrait was Longfellow, and for the other Lowell. To fail in this is to miss the essential thing; without it a book is not even a "sketch." It is only a collection of materials for a sketch.

Mr. Underwood, like Mr. Stoddard, is tempted to insert padding; and there are long passages—as, for instance, the discourse on the forms of poetry (pp. 234-241)—which seem to be extracts from some lecture on English literature. But he sins less in this way than his brother author, and is more careful as to facts, though sometimes heedless. Thus he clearly gives the impression that the Episcopal Theological School near Longfellow's residence is a part of the organization of Harvard University, though the College Catalogue takes pains to state the contrary. In his wish to be critical and decisive in tone, he sometimes does gross injustice and misstates facts. He admits (p. 119) that Poe had a quenchless hatred for New England writers, and attacked them all without mercy; and yet cites the authority of Poe, as if it were worth anything, for the very improbable statement that Margaret Fuller called Longfellow a booby and Lowell a wretched poetaster (p. 124). Why not go to her own writings, which are accessible enough, and find out precisely what she called them? What is Mr. Underwood's standard of accuracy of quotation may be gathered from the following sentence: "Mr. F. B. Sanborn mentions that she called Longfellow a dandy Pindar" (p. 124). But if Mr. Underwood will turn to Margaret Fuller's review of the first illustrated edition (1845) of Longfellow's works ('Papers on Literature and Art,' p. 326), he will find that she applied that epithet, not to the poet himself, but to the portrait of him prefixed to that volume—a portrait not perhaps so bad as that which appears in Mr. Underwood's own volume, but still combining dapperiness and smartness in a way that makes the disrespectful epithet not so ill-fitting, after all. Nor can we believe, until we have chapter and verse for it, that so well-informed a writer as Mr. Sanborn has thus wrested this passage from its original meaning. If he has, Mr. Underwood, as a professed student of American literary history, should have been able to set him right.

In turning from the three books already mentioned to the 'Henry W. Longfellow: Biography, Anecdote, Letters, Criticism' of Mr. W. Sloane Kennedy (Cambridge: Moses King), one feels the sort of satisfaction which is to be found in a rather mediocre work modestly done, when contrasted with works of similar mediocrity and greater pretension. Mr. Kennedy's service has been done mainly with the scissors and paste-brush, but it has been performed laboriously and carefully. His authorities are carefully cited; he keeps clear of gross intrusions on privacy; the book is better printed and bound than any of the others, and, unlike them, it has an index. It comprises the essence of many of the best tributes to Longfellow; includes the inevitable early poems, and the bibliography from the *Literary World*, for which the editor gives credit, as also does Mr. Underwood. It must be owned that it contains a few very apocryphal anecdotes, as the description of Longfellow's night on Vesuvius, which is, however, taken from the *London Times*. Still, it is an honest piece of bookmaking, and will lead every reader to be glad, in view of such an undigested abundance of material, that the real work of preparing Professor Longfellow's memoirs is to be begun at once, by hands wholly competent. After they have appeared, even the best of these four books may be consigned to speedy oblivion.

ROGERS'S HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE
IN ENGLAND.

A History of Agriculture and Prices in England. From the year after the Oxford Parliament (1259) to the Commencement of the Continental War (1793). By James E. Thorold Rogers, M. P. Volumes III. and IV. 1401 to 1582. Oxford: The Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1882.

It is certainly significant, as indicating the present tendency of aggressive work upon economic subjects, that an author who is able to content himself with a small duodecimo volume when writing a 'Political Economy,' should not regard four octavo volumes, averaging seven hundred and forty-five pages each, as too pretentious when presenting a 'History of Agriculture and Prices in England,' though it cover a period of three and a quarter centuries only. This is as encouraging as it is significant. Students are becoming wearied with system building in political economy, and are beginning to recognize that honest work in facts is likely to achieve more permanent results.

The great purpose which Professor Rogers appears to have presented to himself in the preparation of this work was to complement the existing histories of the English people. The political and religious history of England from the standpoint of kings and the Church has been many times written; the growth of the Constitution, portraying development among certain classes of Englishmen, has likewise received frequent attention; something, too, of the character of the people has been learned from a study of what they read and what they sang; while a recent student has undertaken the blending of all these various colorings into a single picture of the life of the English people. But, curiously enough, there has been no satisfactory attempt to uncover the substructure of English history, and to learn of that which, to a large extent, is responsible for all other manifestations of national life.

It is this task which is undertaken in the volumes before us, and the service rendered by Professor Rogers may be said to consist in furnishing the student of industrial society with a certain class of facts never before available, except in the form of original documents. There is no romantic interest in collating records of sales, tenant contracts, articles of apprenticeship, and the like; in tracing the influence of currency measures and changes in custom respecting property, or in comparing price-lists of various commodities, to determine the tendency of the markets; but it is nevertheless true that any reading of history which does not accept these facts as essential for proper interpretation must fail to arrive at the true meaning of the period studied. That Professor Rogers recognizes the importance of the work he has undertaken there can be no question. "I do not doubt," he says, "that at no remote period all history which has neglected the study of the people, and all political economy which has disdained the correction of its conclusions by the evidence which facts supply, will be cast aside as incomplete and even valueless."

The plan of the work is quite simple. When completed it will cover the period from 1259 to 1793. The acceptance of the first date is accidental, being due to the fact that the author found continuous information from that year only. The date 1793, as closing the period of his investigation, is appropriate for two reasons: It marks the beginning of the Continental War, and is also the date at which that great monument of economic research, Tooke's 'History of Prices,' begins. The information contained in the two volumes that have just appeared is

drawn for the most part from the records of purchases made by the great corporations. It would be natural to expect that the task of exploring a later period would be lighter than that of uncovering the facts of a period more remote; but, so far as prices previous to 1582 are concerned, this is not the case. Respecting corn, for example, more accurate information may be procured for the thirteenth and fourteenth than for the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The documents pertaining to the later period, though numerous, fail in comprehensiveness. For the first and second volumes (1259-1400) the author estimates that he consulted eight thousand documents, while for the new volumes (1401-1582) it was necessary to examine ten times that number. It is a source of some satisfaction to learn, however, that the study upon the third period (1583-1793) will not present similar difficulties, since subsequent to the year 1582 wheat and malt averages have been recorded every six months. As further showing the amount of work of which these last two volumes are the result, mention may be made that the record of wheat is drawn from 6,245 entries, and refers to 1,363 localities.

The care taken by the author to reduce his facts to a usable form is worthy of equal commendation. The third volume is devoted to a detailed statement of prices as they stood in the documents consulted. It contains no comments, and undertakes no averages, these being referred to the fourth volume, where one finds the author's interpretation of the facts studied. The system of averages adopted presents the tendency of prices in three forms: the first set refers to years, the second to decades, while the third is drawn for two periods, of which one embraces the 140 years previous to 1540, the other the forty-two years subsequent to that date. This division is admitted to be somewhat arbitrary, but is accepted on account of the importance attached to the influence upon prices of the debased currency issued by Henry VIII.

The peculiar economic interest of these volumes appears to centre in the currency measures of the sixteenth century, the monetary problem introduced being, to our author's mind, a very difficult one. The facts calling for explanation are as follows: From 1300 to 1544 the standard of fineness for English coinage remained unaltered, although the amount of silver in the coins had been continually lessened. Thus the money of 1543 stood to the money of 1299 in the proportion of 1.163 to 3. Yet in the study of prices during this period one observes no rise corresponding to the decreased amount of silver in the coins. In 1544 Henry VIII. began the debasement of the currency by increasing the alloy, and from about that date one observes a marked rise in prices. Is this a monetary phenomenon, or is it referable to other causes? The theory which Professor Rogers offers in explanation is, we believe, his own. It is that, until the coinage reform under Elizabeth, payments were made by weight and not by tale. So long, therefore, as the standard fineness was not impaired, the coining of more or less pieces out of a pound of silver would have no influence on prices. We do not purpose criticising this theory so far as to deny its correctness, but we are constrained to say that there are some difficulties in accepting it.

Thus, in the first place, the absence of direct evidence in its favor is significant, and the indirect testimony offered, that there is frequent record of purchase by the large corporations of instruments for weighing gold and silver, is with equal ease capable of other interpretation. Again, if payments were made by weight and not by tale, there could have been no motive for clipping or for making any distinction between foreign low-weight and domestic full-weight

coins. That such distinctions were made, and that the practice of clipping was general, is evidenced by the frequent enactments for the remedy of these evils; indeed, the reduction in the size of coins above mentioned was made in order that the new issues might correspond to the money already in circulation which had been debased by clipping. All this care to keep the coins of the realm uniform would have been unnecessary if the Government guaranteed the quality of the metal only, and professed no care respecting the quantity contained in the various pieces.

In the third place, this explanation of Professor Rogers neglects a recent modification of that law of monetary circulation, known as Gresham's Law, without which it cannot be regarded as correct. This law says that good and bad money cannot circulate together, but that the bad will drive out the good. That is, looking at the matter from another standpoint, the price of goods will be adjusted to the worst money in circulation, and no one will use a heavy coin to do the work which a light one would do as well. Prof. Francis A. Walker is, we believe, the first American economist who pointed out the fact that as stated this law is not true. Only when there is a superabundance of circulating medium will the best coins cease to be used. If an issue of debased coin is not sufficient to supply the wants of trade, prices will not be graded to the debased coin, and there will be for the time a concurrent circulation of good and bad money, as though all were good. Professor Rogers has, it appears to us, overlooked this fact, and proceeds in his reasoning as though prices quickly adjusted themselves to the new issues, no matter what the amount of the issue. Thus he says (p. 193, vol. iv.) that the price of wheat in 1547 was "lower than any recorded price if payment were made by tale." To support this conclusion he estimates the amount of silver given in payment upon the basis of the amount contained in the debased issues, yet fails to show that the new issues from 1543 were sufficiently large to supplant the money already in circulation. That this was not the case we have direct evidence in the result of the reformation of the currency in 1560; for notwithstanding the fact that Elizabeth restored the currency to its original fineness, and coined shillings containing 88.8 grains of silver in the place of certain issues falling as low as twenty, it was yet possible for her to manufacture £783,248 of new money out of the amount of silver brought in, which, according to the rates of the several standards, amounted to £638,113 only. This is conclusive proof that the bullion value of the average coin in circulation was greater than even the recoined standard of the reformed coinage, and therefore that the debased issues were not sufficiently large to cause prices to be graded to them. While they circulated they did the work of better coins. We would not say that Professor Rogers's theory is incorrect, but rather that there appears to be no necessity for any theory upon the subject, since, under a proper conception of the co-circulation of full-weight and debased coins, there is no variation in prices which cannot be otherwise explained.

By far the most pertinent of the conclusions reached in this study relates to the comparative well-being of the laboring classes in the Middle Ages and under the modern industrial régime. The facts upon which it rests are too voluminous for insertion here, but a careful comparison of the rate of wages with the price of living necessities at various times leads Professor Rogers to support the complaint of the laborer that he has not partaken equally with the other classes of the benefits of our material civilization. The downfall of the English laborer dates from the

death of Henry VIII., the immediate occasion being the interference on the part of that monarch with the currency. The cause, however, lies deeper than this; it is only found when one perceives the radical changes in the industrial system which the new forces of modern individualism introduced. We cannot do better than quote the judgment of the author upon this point. Speaking of the conclusions to which his facts have led him, he says:

"They are stated in the briefest form when I refer to the fact that, while the rise, during the last forty-two years of the period before me [1540-1582] in the price of provisions was 2.71, the prices of the previous 140 years being taken as unity, the rise in the price of labor, and of objects whose main value depended upon labor, was only 1.64. These figures concentrate the results derivable from an analysis of facts. . . . They tell of the long cloud which was coming over the old sunshine of labor, and show how it was that the mass of the people was about to exchange a condition of comparative opulence and comfort for penury and misery, unhappily prolonged for centuries. From the Reformation till the Revolution the condition of the English laborer grew darker and darker. From the Revolution to the outbreak of the war of American Independence his lot was a little lightened, but only by the plenty of the seasons and the warmth of the sun. From the war of American Independence to the repeal of the Corn Laws it was at its very worst."

It is one thing for an agitator to make such statements; it is quite another when they are given as the result of scholarly and temperate research. It shows us that there does exist a social question.

As a compendium of useful, indeed essential, information, this work does not require the praise of a reviewer. Its merit is such that, when completed, it should, and probably will, gain for its author a reputation as a statistical economist equal to that of Thomas Tooke.

CHARLES DICKENS.

Dickens. By Adolphus William Ward. [English Men of Letters.] Harper & Bros. 1882.

MR. WARD has not found much to say about Dickens that is new; indeed, the only part of his volume which can in any degree be regarded as an original contribution to literature (all the biographical portion of the work is necessarily based on Mr. Forster's life) is his chapter on the "Future of Dickens's Fame." In this he maintains that there is no reason to believe that Dickens's popularity has diminished since his death; that his influence may be traced through the writings of other novelists of great reputation, as, for instance, George Eliot in England, the author of 'Debit and Credit' in Germany, Bret Harte in the United States, and Daudet in France. There is no doubt about the last two, and the case of Daudet is a very remarkable one, for, a priori, one would have said that there would be nothing so unlikely to happen in literature as that a Parisian novelist of the Empire should import and make his own the humorous and pathetic treatment of character which was the foundation of Dickens's success. It was, in fact, almost a piece of literary sleight-of-hand, and everything in the general condition of French fiction at the time of Daudet's appearance on the scene would have warranted the prediction that it would prove impossible. Not very long before, indeed, Janin had tried to make Dickens popular in France, and the only result was that Thackeray was able to hold Janin up to ridicule for the benefit of the English public. Still, this evidence of Dickens's influence on general literature does not help us much, as Mr. Ward says, to judge how long it is likely to last, for a literary fashion which seems for the time to change the face of literature, may suddenly disappear as completely as if it had

never existed. What, for instance, has become of the "Romantic School," whether in prose fiction or the drama? Victor Hugo survives, but he is little more than a monument of its ruin, and of the triumph of Realism. The temporary though widespread influence of Dickens cannot therefore be regarded as indicative of his permanent reputation.

Again, it would, as Mr. Ward points out, be an entire mistake to imagine that any future generation can find in 'Oliver Twist' or 'Nicholas Nickleby' everything that the first readers of these novels found in them. Much that constitutes the broad background of Dickens's stories is wholly gone. The Fleet, the Marshalsea, indeed, a great part of the London of his day, is already swept away. The life from which he drew his characters is in great measure gone too, as Mr. Ward might have pointed out. Any one may see, by looking at a few of Cruikshank's familiar plates, that they would not serve even as caricatures of contemporary London life. It is probably safe to say that as England has more and more during the last fifty years felt the influence of the great levelling democratic wave, human character there has lost more and more of its grotesque individuality. The edges of it have been blunted; mankind has become more reserved and shy of showing peculiarities with the freedom of our old friends Sairey Gamp and Betsy Prigg, and Tony Weller and Sam, and Mr. Pickwick, and the rest of the company. The very occupation which produced Tony is gone, and the type is no longer recognizable as taken from reality. The Mr. Pickwick of to-day has lost Mr. Pickwick's naïf simplicity, or is ashamed to show it, and Sam's familiar intercourse with his master would now be rendered impossible, partly by the latter's dread of servants, which Thackeray first pointed out to be one of the marked peculiarities of modern life, and partly by his own increased sense of dignity and equality. In 'Martin Chuzzlewit' Dickens produced what was a painfully good caricature of American society as he saw it; but in this country the changes have been so great as to make large parts of it now seem flat, and probably it is not unfair to say that there was about the same relation between the American part of 'Martin Chuzzlewit' and the American society of the first half of this century as there was between 'Oliver Twist' or 'Nicholas Nickleby' and the England of Dickens's early life. The world which those books painted at the time in such bright and living colors is gone, and for that, though it is unfair to hold Dickens accountable, his reputation must gradually suffer.

Mr. Ward undertakes to vindicate Dickens from the charge of being a "self-made" writer, but his success is not great. Dickens's novels and letters show him to have had some acquaintance with Goldsmith, Fielding, Smollett, and the British essayists. He was also an "attentive and judicious student of Hogarth," but in the nineteenth century a writer of prose humorous fiction could hardly have been less thoroughly equipped for his task than this. The evidence that Dickens in his treatment of his subjects was influenced by the English classical novelists is very slight. Mr. Ward, who is occasionally disqualified for his task by a determination to be too subtly critical, cites a passage from 'Martin Chuzzlewit' as being "pure Fielding": "It was morning, and the beautiful Aurora, of whom so much hath been written, said, and sung, did with her rosy fingers nip and tweak Miss Pecksniff's nose. It was the frolicsome custom of the goddess, in her intercourse with the fair Cherry, to do so; or, in more prosaic phrase, the tip of that feature in the sweet girl's countenance was always very red at breakfast time." This jum-

ble of the heroic in style with the commonplace and vulgar in substance may have been introduced into English prose fiction by Fielding; but it has so long been anybody's trick that it is hardly safe in Dickens's case to make his study of Fielding the cause of it.

Whatever he owed to other writers, it was, Mr. Ward admits, "but little in comparison to his natural gifts." We should be willing to go further, and to say, almost nothing. First among these gifts, of course, come his humor and pathos, which, according to Mr. Ward, were "twin products" of his "sensibility"; though how any appreciation of their literary value is advanced by fathering them upon this latter quality, which is almost as indefinite as intellect itself, we do not see. What we want to get at is the quality of the humor and pathos, for as to its existence there can be no doubt; and here Mr. Ward suggests—though he does not himself see the bearing of the suggestion—the solution of the problem.

"But Nature," he says, "when she gifted Dickens with sensibility, observation, and imagination, had bestowed upon him yet another boon in the quality which seems more prominent than any other in his whole being. The vigor of Dickens—a mental and moral vigor supported by a splendid physical organism—was the parent of some of his foibles; among the rest, of his tendency to exaggeration. No fault has been more frequently found with his workmanship than this; nor can he be said to have defended himself very successfully on this head when he declared that he did not recollect ever to have heard or seen the charge of exaggeration made against a feeble performance, though in its feebleness it may have been most untrue." But without this vigor he could not have been creative as he was; and in him there were accordingly united with rare completeness a swift responsiveness to the impulses of humor and pathos, and inexhaustible fertility in discovering and inventing materials for their exercise, and the constant creative desire to give to these newly-created materials a vivid plastic form."

Now, this tendency to exaggeration in Dickens enables us to make a pretty good guess as to the permanence of his literary reputation. Many kinds of humor profit by exaggeration. The secret of caricature lies in knowing where and how to exaggerate; and Dickens's humor was the humor of caricature. Take exaggerated humorous character out of his works, and what would be left? The plots are poor, except in the case of the 'Tale of Two Cities,' which if it stood alone would have shown Dickens to be a wonder, fully clever man, but nothing more; the moral lessons taught in them are trite, and the sentiment commonplace. It is the humorous characters that make the novels live, and they were the result of studies by an observer as keen as ever set himself to the depiction of the mental peculiarities and eccentricities of his fellows. The low London life with which his boyhood had made him familiar, was full of character, and he saw it all. Society—the upper classes—was as a sealed book to him, which he never had an opportunity of taking down from its shelf till his fame was matured and his habits of observation fixed. But the London types of his childhood he thoroughly understood, and with a fund of animal spirits and sympathy, which of themselves almost amounted to genius, and a power of humorous exaggeration such as has been shown by no other writer of our time, he poured forth the most delightful series of caricatures that the world has ever seen. But the very exaggeration which helped his humor ruined his pathos. Exaggerated pathos is a contradiction in terms, and the exaggeration is sure to be detected sooner or later. It is certainly a very puzzling thing that Dickens's pathos should not have struck the public of his own day as a caricatured pathos, laid on with a very thick brush. It does strike most people so now,

even those who most delight in the inconsequence of Mrs. Gamp and the riotous imagination of Jingle. But whatever the explanation of this improvement of taste, we cannot escape it, or allow any one to persuade us, as Mr. Ward attempts to do, that Dickens's pathos will ever be regarded as one of his permanent titles to fame. That he is sure of rank as one of the great humorists of this century cannot be doubted. His humor, was, however, to a very great extent the humor of external observation and exaggerated description of types which are disappearing or have already gone. Of the humor which grows naturally out of character, and of which Thackeray is so full, Dickens had little perception; and this fact necessarily sets limits to the popularity of his works. It is difficult to conceive of even the best caricatures having a permanent place in literature.

Men and Books; or, Studies in Homiletics. Lectures Introductory to the Theory of Preaching. By Austin Phelps, D.D., late Bartlett Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in Andover Theological Seminary. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1882.

THE twenty-two lectures in this volume resemble the lectures contained in Professor Phelps's 'Theory of Preaching' in that they retain their original form and style as prepared for lecture-room delivery; but they differ from the latter in being much less formal, much more free and easy in their general structure, and consequently much better adapted to arrest the attention of the general public and excite its interest. The contents of the book are unequally divided by the "Men" and "Books" which appear upon the title-page; the first six lectures treating of the one, the last sixteen of the other. Those upon "Men" are a succession of forcible and manly pleas for a fair amount of worldliness, properly understood, in the clerical character and experience. The preacher who secludes himself from the ordinary interests of mankind, who does not keep himself well informed concerning the common affairs of business, and politics, and social life, is very apt to prove himself a fool when he is suddenly compelled to meet some practical emergency. Then, too, the chances are that the preaching of a recluse will be entirely inappropriate to the needs of his particular congregation. Here, by the way, Coleridge's famous saying, "If I were a preacher in Cornwall, I would preach fifty-two Sundays a year against wrecking," is sadly spoiled in the quotation. Professor Phelps's advice to the clergy to read what other men are reading is pertinent to his general purpose; but the incidental remark that Scott's novels bankrupted his publishers is far from being true to the actual circumstances of the case. In treating of the relation of the clergy to reforms, Professor Phelps is wiser than his generation; in the anti-slavery struggle the clergy did not take the course which he advises. They were generally "hind-captains." He is weak, however, in his justification of Trendlenburg and Hengstenberg in their defence of Bismarck's policy of blood and iron. But he concedes that this action on their part has been a fruitful source of German infidelity.

Professor Phelps's lectures upon Books are not intended to be general in their character, but to treat of literature in its relations to ministerial culture and activity. They are remarkable for their catholicity. If the hundreds of young men who listened to them went away from Andover and settled down to exclusively theological reading, their dust cannot be mountains on Professor Phelps's head. The course of reading which he advises is inclusive of all the greatest names

of ancient and modern literature. He is a lover of the novelists and poets as well as of the theologians and critics; and his love of the best literature generally is so hearty that it would seem that it must have been contagious. Many a young man must owe to Professor Phelps a debt of gratitude for his introduction into Chaucer's world, or Bacon's, or Dante's. His very dogmatism is impressive and inspiring. But some of his judgments will not bear a close examination, as, for example, where he says: "In prose fiction Walter Scott and Charles Dickens are the only names which deserve to precede that of Cooper." His American bias is plain in this judgment and in many others. In a chapter on American theology it is made evident that Dr. Newman Smyth would have been a very natural successor of Professor Phelps's chair. He frankly says of the New England theologians:

"The system they framed was not Calvinism, as Calvin taught and preached. They started with the claim that theology is an improvable science, and they ended with the claim that they had improved it. They claimed to have evolved more completely and symmetrically than Calvin had done the spirit of the Scriptures, and to have made the Scriptural faith appear more reasonable and more accordant with the necessary beliefs of the human mind."

But the New England theologians do not please him altogether. Jonathan Edwards's famous Enfield sermon, "Sinners in the hands of an angry God," meets with his flattest disapproval. His opinion of Emerson is not relevant to this particular aspect of his thought, but is made more interesting by Emerson's recent death: "His is a diseased mind, and the world is sure to find it out. Some of you will live to witness a change of literary opinion of him not unlike that which has overtaken the literary fame of Byron. . . . Pure as his private life is, it is impossible for his intellect to be great and true literary seer [*sic*] so long as he hesitates whether or not to apply to the being of God the personal pronoun." Is not Professor Phelps too hard on the young minister on whose table he found a book of three hundred duodecimo pages on the culture of poultry, while he had never read the 'Faerie Queene'? We are acquainted with a minister of moderate salary whose family consumed twenty-five hundred eggs, laid by his own hens, in one year. Thus he was enabled to live and preach the Gospel. He, too, has a book on the culture of poultry, and the 'Faerie Queene' would not have served his purpose half as well.

Losse Blätter aus dem Geheim-Archiv der russischen Regierung. [Stray Leaves from the Secret Archives of the Russian Government.] Ein aktenmässiger Beitrag zur neuesten Geschichte der russischen Verwaltung und Beamten-Corruption. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. 1882.

THIS little book of revelations is probably the most curious of all authentic publications of the kind issued since the death of Alexander Herzen. Its authenticity is warranted not only by the character of the publishing house under whose auspices it anonymously appears, but by internal evidence of the most striking nature. We find no clew to its authorship, but doubt not that it comes, directly or indirectly, from a person of high standing in the innermost spheres of imperial power at St. Petersburg. Julius Eckardt, the able writer of so many anonymous books on modern Russia, may possibly have had editorial control of it, though the smoothness and chasteness of the style—qualities which but seldom mark the pages of the Livonian author—mitigate against this supposition. The facts communicated in the 'Losse

Blätter'—which would be startling in a high degree were we not long prepared for the worst in listening to accounts of Russian corruption—are selected with a discriminating eye to accuracy and general importance, and not with a special regard to piquancy. In fact, personalities are rather avoided, and, excepting the chapter devoted to the doings of the Ministry of the Navy, under the special and all-powerful control of the Grand Duke Constantine Nikolayevitch, late Admiral-General of the Empire, a kind of thin veil is charitably thrown over the personal interference of the highest participants in the transactions described. Public gossip and court talk are entirely excluded, and no woman is made to appear behind the scene. That the Grand Duke Nicholas, like Constantine a brother of the late Czar, and commander-in-chief in the Bulgarian campaign, is badly implicated, in spite of the care with which almost all individual delinquencies are charged to account of offices and organizations, is owing chiefly to the circumstance that the largest and most important division of the book consists of a secret report, presented to Alexander II. by the Comptroller-General, on the management of the Army in the Turkish war of 1877—a war in which Nicholas Nikolayevitch figured so lamentably as a general and so scandalously as a prince.

This report—a most remarkable document—is copied from the secret archives of the Court, and most of the author's communications are extracted from similar secret reports. The office of Comptroller-General—or, properly, Comptroller of the Empire—is one of the most important in the governmental machinery of the Czar. He belongs to the committee of state ministers—a cabinet proper does not exist in Russia—has the right to examine into the affairs and money accounts of all the departments, excepting the Ministry of the Imperial Household; receives the reports of subordinate courts of control throughout the empire; communicates with each Minister separately or with all collectively, as well as with the Imperial Council; and reports directly to the Emperor. The Comptroller-General Tatarinoff, Abaza, Greigh, and Solski, who successively occupied this office during the last decade of the late reign, all enjoyed their master's confidence, and the reports of the last two, from which the contents of the pages before us are mainly drawn, surely deserve credit for bold and explicit statements of fact and terse remarks of a general and prospective character. It is almost sickening to see the affairs of one of the greatest monarchies of the globe constantly—though, of course, not exclusively—carried on on the plan of such "statesmen" as Tweed and Sweeney; its quartermaster and commissary departments throughout a most momentous war managed in the way which was familiar to us in the palmy days of shoddy contractorship in 1861; its transportation for the men in the field executed with the fidelity of our Star-route managers; its naval management putting to the blush the squanderers of our marine resources under the Robeson régime; many of its public buildings, docks, railroads, and war-vessels constructed at rates rivaling the expenses of the New York Court-house. It is melancholy to read the brief, timid, despondent interjected remarks pencilled on the margins of the secret reports by a ruler eager to reform the public service, but impotent to break through the meshes of a spoils system embracing every organization in his vast dominions. Alexander II. was as much a victim of official corruption in his reign as he was of Nihilism in his death. And there is no doubt that Nihilism draws its sap as much from corruption as from tyranny. All these national diseases mutually nourish and develop each other.

Eighteenth Century Essays, selected and annotated by Austin Dobson. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1882. Pp. xxiii.-284.

THIS delightful little book contains the cream, the *dessus du panier*, of the numberless essays on human frailties and foibles, on costumes and on customs, and on manners in general, put forth in the century which was most prolific in the true essay, and in which the true essay is perhaps seen in its highest perfection. It contains the best of the more humorous sketches of social life and character lightly limned for us by Steele and Addison, by Johnson and Goldsmith. As we turn its pages we are astonished at the freshness of these portraits from life, these jibes at passing vanities. As Mr. Dobson puts it, "the frivolous chatter of the Syracusan ladies in Theocritus is still heard at every Hyde Park review," and "the Crispinus and Sufferus of Horace and Catullus still haunt our clubs and streets"; and so the Will Wimbles and Beau Tibbises of the essayist are men whom we are wont to greet daily. It is needless at this late hour to praise these portraits, or to declare their charm; but one may venture to say that the Horatian quality in the eighteenth-century essayists has never been shown so clearly before as in the present volume. The freshness of the essays is scarcely more remarkable than the skill with which they have been chosen. There is not one too many or too few. Very quaint also and pleasant is the eighteenth-century air which Mr. Dobson has managed to impart to the volume: it has a rubricated title-page with many rules across it and a Latin motto; it has that "one needful and indeed indispensable Detail, the Dedication to an Illustrious Personage"; it has an admirable frontispiece, a bold drawing of the Tory fox-hunter, by Mr. Randolph Caldecott; it has catchwords at the foot of every page; it has notes quite in the eighteenth-century manner and full of curious learning; and it has a prefatory rondeau regretting that now

"We may not work—ah! would we might,
With slower pen!"

While the editor has done all we could hope or more, the publishers have done less. The volume is one of the *Parchment* series, intended to imitate if not to emulate the excellences of the publications of MM. Lemerre and Jouaust. The present volume falls far short of that standard. The registry of the pages, for example, is wofully inaccurate, as a glance at the running head-lines of the introduction will abundantly prove, and the book is put into its parchment covers in a very slovenly manner: the lower edges actually project below the cover.

Faith Victorious, Being an Account of the Life and Labors of the Venerable Dr. Johann Ebel, late Archdeacon of the old Town Church of Königsberg, in Prussia. Drawn from Authentic Sources by J. I. Mombert, D.D. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.

WE have here the biography of a Lutheran clergyman little known outside of Germany, but entitled to a wider recognition, in the opinion of his biographer, on account of "his commanding intellect, interesting history, and apostolic zeal in the maintenance and vindication of pure and true evangelical doctrine in opposition to the scepticism and deadness of German Christianity in the first third of this century." Here are three counts, and only the last of them is likely to impress the average reader of to-day, be he never so evangelical. Ebel's zeal was surely apostolic, but for traces of a commanding intellect we seek in vain; and however interesting his history may have been to himself and others at the time when he was making it, it has now a re-

markably remote and archaeological appearance, like to some implement discovered in a kitchen-midden or a lake-dwelling of the primitive peoples. We have lived fast since 1842, when Ebel's labors came to an end in Königsberg. The questions by which he was agitated have given place to others of a profounder nature, and it requires the most strenuous effort to put ourselves imaginatively in the place of those who lived in Ebel's time and helped him fight his battles.

He was born March 4, 1784, and died August 18, 1861. We get the impression of a radiant, beaming personality—of a man living almost exclusively on an emotional plane—affectionate, kindly, but a good hater withal, and exhibiting the *gratium certaminis* in the fullest measure. In 1839 he was degraded from his archdeaconship, apparently for attempting to conform his teachings too closely to those of the New Testament, but he was charged with the attempt to found a sect. The details of the suit against him are given in a wearisome manner. Dr. Mombert expresses his opinion of the persons engaged in this controversy with much force and freedom: the once distinguished commentator, Olshausen, is set down as "a self-seeker," "a contemptible individual." Deprived of his position, Ebel had many consolations. Indeed, his biography is pleasantest when treating of his life in exile from his beloved Königsberg. In an appendix three of his sermons are given. They are earnest and simple, but not in any way remarkable. It is too much to hope, with Dr. Mombert, that this book will be "a blessing and a joy to all who read it," but some may find in it a feeble satisfaction.

The Vicksburg Campaign, and the Battles about Chattanooga under the command of Gen. U. S. Grant in 1862-63: An Historical Review. By Samuel Rockwell Reed. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1882.

THE theory of this book, reiterated on every page, is that the soldiers of the war of 1861-65 were all-wise and their generals all-foolish; that the soldiers brought the war to a successful conclusion by their unaided efforts, while the generals perversely threw every obstacle in their path for four long years; that our Army, in short, was such that it needed no head or direction, and suffered greatly from such direction as was imposed upon it. For many ages people have thought and written that an army without a head was a mob; that the best soldiers that ever lived could accomplish nothing except when intelligently led; that the same troops when commanded by a competent general achieved victory, and by an incompetent one, defeat; and these ideas have even been illustrated by contrasting the disasters which befell intelligent volunteers at Fredericksburg, at Manassas, and at Chickamauga, with the victories achieved by identically the same class of men at Donelson, at Vicksburg, at Chattanooga, at Atlanta, and at Appomattox. But we must now believe that all such ideas are opposed to "the most elementary principles of the art of war," and that the most conspicuous successes followed the most egregious blunders on the part of the generals. Plain people, not versed in the "art of war," will, we fear, ask for more blundering generals of that sort—as Mr. Lincoln, when told that Grant was addicted to drinking, is said to have asked the brand of his whiskey, that he might distribute it throughout the Army. In support of this "most amusing paradox," that an army is best without a leader, the author selects the campaigns of Gen. Grant in the West, from the occupation of Memphis to the battle of Chattanooga, and writes 200 pages of fine, newspaper print to prove, not that Grant made mistakes,

as mortal men have ever done, generals included, but that his every move was a gross and signal blunder, and that in all of them there was not one redeeming feature; that Grant's controlling ideas were, "to beat McClelland," "to slaughter his army," "to run away from Vicksburg," etc., etc.

It is the essence of a paradox that it is not amenable to reason, and it would indeed be idle to reason with this book, in which there is neither reason, nor sense, nor justice, nor truth, nor statement to which the intelligent man need give heed. To those who find a pleasure in incoherent abuse of a name that others respect, this book will be welcome; but those who believe, as did the vast majority of the Army and the loyal people of the North, that the very operations at Vicksburg and Chattanooga which are here described as foolish blunders were the first of the great victories which ended the war, will find little to interest them in these long pages of incoherent, carping criticism.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

- Abel, C. *Linguistic Essays*. London: Trübner & Co.
Banks, Mary R. *Bright Days in the Old Plantation Time*. Boston: Lee & Shepard. \$1.50.
Baillie-Grohman, W. A. *Camps in the Rockies*. Chas. Scribner's Sons. \$1.75.
Beecher, H. W. *Sermons in Plymouth Church*. September, 1872-March, 1874. Foris, Howard & Hildbert. \$1.75.
Cherouny, H. *Socialism and Christianity*. The Author. 15 cents.
Cook, Mrs. J. C. *A Woman's Perils*. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros. 75 cents.
Criswell, B. W. *The New Shakespeare, and Other Travaux*. American News Co. \$1.
Cummins, Maria S. *Mabel Vaughan*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.50.
D'Anvers, N. *Vegetable Life*. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 50 cents.
D'Anvers, N. *Forms of Land and Water*. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 50 cents.
De Vere, A. *The Foray of Queen Meave, and other Legends of Ireland's Heroic Age*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.
De Valdés, J. *Commentary upon the Gospel of St. Matthew*. London: Trübner & Co.
De Valdés, J. *Commentary upon the Sermon on the Mount. Lives of the Twin Brothers, Juan and Alfonso de Valdés*. London: Trübner & Co.
De Valdés, J. *Spiritual Milk; or, Christian Instruction for Children*. London: Trübner & Co.
Falkner, W. C. *The Little Brick Church: a Novel*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. \$1.50.
Fornelli, N. *L'Insegnamento pubblico ai nostri tempi*. Rome: Forzani.
Hood's Own Whims and Oddities. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 25 cents.
Hudson-River Route. Lake George, Lake Champlain, Adirondacks, Montreal, and Quebec. Talbot Bros., Merrill & Co. 25 cents.
In the Saddle: A Collection of Poems on Horseback-Riding. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.
Keyser, Harriette A. *On the Borderland: a Novel*. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.
Lawson, J. D. *Leading Cases of the Common Law Simplified*. St. Louis: F. H. Thomas & Co.
Marjory Graham: a Novel. G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.
Muir, Allan. *Lady Beauty*. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 60 cts.
Newman, F. W. *Libyan Vocabulary: An Essay Toward Reproducing the Ancient Numidian Language*. London: Trübner & Co.
North American Review. Vol. cxxxiv.
Papil, on, T. L. *Virgil, with an Introduction and Notes*. In two vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Pomeroy, J. N. *A Treatise on Equity Jurisprudence*. In three vols. Vol. II. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.
Randolph, Mrs. Iris. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. \$1.25.
Russell, W. C. *The Lady Mand: Schooner Yacht*. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 20 cents.
Seaver, E. P., and Walton, G. A. *The Franklin Elementary Algebra*. Boston: William Ware & Co.
Severance, M. S. *Hammermith: His Harvard Days*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. \$1.50.
Smith, T. R., and Slater, J. *Architecture, Classic and Early Christian*. Scribner & Welford.
Stieler, A. *Hand-Atlas*. Parts 31, 32 (conclusion). B. Westermann & Co.
Taylor, G. *Antinous: a Romance of Ancient Rome*. Wm. S. Gottsberger.
Toller, T. N. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, Based on the Manuscript Collections of the late Joseph Bosworth, D.D., F.R.S.* Parts 1 and 2. A-H-W. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Tyndall, J. *Essays on the Floating Matter of the Air*. D. Appleton & Co.
Trumble, A. *Great Artists of the American Stage*. Part I. New York: Richard K. Fox. 50 cents.
Vapereau, G. *Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains. Supplément à la cinquième édition*. N. Y. F. W. Christern. 40 cents.
Wright, G. F. *Studies in Science and Religion*. An dover: W. F. Draper. \$1.50.

YALE COLLEGE

Catalogue for 1881-82, under "Sheffield Scientific School," says: "For preparation in algebra and geometry, the recently-published text-books of Prof. Newcomb on this subject (Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1881) may, without indicating undue preference, be especially recommended."

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Register for 1882-83, under "Requirements for Examination": "3. In *Mathematics*, Solid Geometry, and Conic Sections, as much as is contained in 'Newcomb's Elements of Geometry'; Advanced Algebra, as much as is contained in 'Olney's University Algebra,' or in 'Newcomb's Algebra.'"

NEWCOMB'S
Mathematical Course.

By Simon Newcomb, Prof. of Mathematics U. S. Navy, Supt. of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac, Member of the National Academy, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, etc.; one of the authors of Newcomb and Holden's 'Astronomy,' etc., etc.

READY:

ALGEBRA, for Schools. \$1 20.

ALGEBRA, for Colleges. \$1 75.

GEOMETRY. \$1 50.

TRIGONOMETRY. \$1 50.

TRIGONOMETRY, with Log and other Tables. \$2.

LOGARITHMIC and other Tables. \$1 40.

IN PREPARATION:

PLANE GEOMETRY & TRIGONOMETRY. (In Press.)

ANALYTICAL GEOMETRY (in 1882).

CALCULUS.

Copies of any of the above sent, post-paid, to teachers for examination, upon receipt of half the advertised prices.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

ELIANE.

A Novel. From the French of Mme. AUGUSTUS CRAVEN.

"'Eliane' is interesting, not only because it is such a record of the best kind of French life and manners as could only have been written by a person thoroughly at home in the subject, but also because of the delicate drawing of character which it contains. The book is quiet in tone, and may fall to please readers who care for nothing but incident; but there are, it may be hoped, still many readers to whom its grace and fine style will recommend it."—*London Saturday Review*, June 3, 1882.

1 vol., paper, 50 cents; cloth, 90 cents.

WILLIAM S. GOTTSCHEBERGER, Publisher,
No. 11 Murray Street, New York.

IN any family, whether large or small, but especially where the number of children is large, a record of the constitutional peculiarities of each one, and the whole course of its physical development in sickness and in health, is certain to be instructive and may prove invaluable. Such a record is Professor J. B. Fossagrives's 'Mother's Register,' consisting of a series of tables scientifically arranged for brief and convenient entries. A separate volume for boys and for girls. Price, post-paid, 75 cents per volume, or \$1 25 for two volumes. Address Publisher of the Nation.

Lippincott's Magazine,

AN ILLUSTRATED MONTHLY OF POPULAR LITERATURE.

AUGUST NUMBER,

NOW READY.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS.

CONTAINING: 1. ST. JEROME'S DAY WITH THE PUEBLO INDIANS. By E. T. L. Illustrated.—2. RUTH. By George Birdseye.—3. FAIRY GOLD. A Story. Illustrated.—4. AN ADIRONDACK HOME. By P. Deming.—5. EDGE-TOOLS. A Story. By Eleanor Putnam.—6. IN THE HEART OF THE ALLEGHIANES. Two Papers. (11.) By M. G. Van Rensselaer.—7. THE ROMANCE OF CHILDHOOD. By Henry A. Beers.—8. MRS. LARRABEE'S MORNING CALL. A Story. By Charles Dunning.—9. OVER THE MOUNTAINS. By Charles L. Hildreth.—10. BAY BEAUTIES AND BAY BREEZES. By P. V. Huyssoon.—11. MARCY HARTWICK. A Story. By Chauncey Hickox.—12. CLOSING IN. By Paul Hamilton Hayne.—13. SHIRES AND SHIRE TOWNS IN THE SOUTH. By Anthony Van Wyck.—14. OUR MONTHLY GOSSIP: 1. *Public Topics*: The Political Situation in Pennsylvania. 2. *Place and Dances*: A Study of Children. 3. *Art Matters*: Means of Fostering American Art. 4. *Anecdotal and Miscellaneous*: 7. *University Readings*. Clubs of London.—15. LITERATURE OF

FOR SALE BY ALL BOOK AND NEWS DEALERS.

TERMS: Yearly Subscription, \$3; Single Number, 25 cents. LIBERAL CLUB RATES.
SPECIMEN NUMBER mailed, post-paid, on receipt of 20 cents. (Postage stamps afford a convenient form of remittance.)

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., Publishers,
715 and 717 Market St., Philadelphia.

To Summer Tourists.

THE 1882 EDITION OF THE

Lake Superior
Transit Co.'s
TOURIST GUIDE

IS NOW READY.

Copies sent gratis on receipt of stamp by addressing

T. P. CARPENTER,
Gen. Pass. Agent, Buffalo, N. Y.

NORTH GERMAN LLOYD
STEAMSHIP COMPANY,
FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken. RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.

First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$80; Steerage, \$30; Prepaid Steerage Certificates, \$24. For freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,
2 Bowling Green.

THE HYGEIA HOTEL, Old Point Comfort, Va., situated 100 yards from Fort Monroe. Open all the year. Equal to any hotel in the United States as a Summer Resort or Cold Weather Sanitarium. Send for circular describing hygienic advantages, etc.

TELESCOPES OF EXTRA FINE quality, both for Astronomical and Landscape use; Microscopes at greatly reduced prices; Perimeters; Opera, Field, and Marine Glasses of great power and with all the recent improvements in finish, lenses, and weight; Brazilian Pebble Spectacles and Eye-Glasses of finest quality, \$4 per pair. Send stamp for 116-page fine illustrated Catalogue.

BENJ. PIKE'S SON & CO., 928 Broadway, N. Y.

The Portable Bookcase

(PATENTED)

In Ebony, Cherry, Black Walnut, or Ash. Solid and Permanent. No room where Books are used complete without it.

For descriptive circular and price-list, address the sole makers, LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., 381 Washington St. Boston.

THOMPSON & ODELL Publishers of
Orchestra and Band Music.
Catalogues sent free on application.

THOMPSON & ODELL,
177 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

THE WESTERN

Farm Mortgage Co.,

LAWRENCE, KANSAS.

FIRST MORTGAGE LOANS

Upon improved productive farms in the best localities in the West negotiated for banks, colleges, estates, and private individuals. Coupon Bonds. Interest and principal paid on day of maturity at the THIRD NATIONAL BANK in NEW YORK CITY. Funds promptly placed. Large experience. No losses. Investors compelled to take no land. No delays in payment of interest. Only the very choicest loans accepted. Full information given to those seeking SAFE AND PROFITABLE INVESTMENTS. Send for circular, references, and sample documents.

F. M. PERKINS, Pres. L. H. PERKINS, Sec.
J. T. WARNE, Vice-Pres. C. W. GILLET, Treas.
N. F. HART, Auditor.

KOUNTZE BROTHERS,

BANKERS,

No. 129 BROADWAY (EQUITABLE BUILDING), NEW YORK.

DEPOSITS RECEIVED,

subject to check at sight, and interest allowed on balances.

Government and other bonds and investment securities bought and sold on commission.

Telegraphic transfers made to London and to various places in the United States.

Bills drawn on the Union Bank of London.

LETTERS OF CREDIT

Star Notes issued for the use of travellers in all world.

FIRST NATIONAL
BANK OF MILWAUKEE,

No. 2,715,

Has been organized (and is in full operation) to take the place of the First National Bank of Milwaukee, No. 64, now in liquidation, as appears by the following

NOTICE:

The First National Bank of Milwaukee, located in Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin, is closing up its affairs. All note-holders and other creditors of said Association are therefore hereby notified to present the notes and other claims against the Association for payment.

Dated June 1, 1882.

H. H. CAMP, Cashier.

T. B. BROOKS, JACOB HOUGHTON, FRED. J. KNIGHT
Newburgh, N. Y., Box 208,

MINING GEOLOGISTS and IRON EXPERTS, offer to Capitalists an opportunity to invest in SOUTHERN IRON and COAL LANDS, of which they have personal knowledge. Would prefer to take commission in an undivided interest.

BROWN BROTHERS & CO.,

59 WALL STREET,

ISSUE COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS

For use in

THIS COUNTRY AND ABROAD.

KIDDER, PEABODY & CO.,

1 Nassau St., N. Y.; 113 Devonshire St., Boston.

EXCHANGE AND LETTERS OF CREDIT ON GREAT BRITAIN AND THE CONTINENT.

Correspondents:

BARING BROTHERS & CO., London;

FERIER FRERES & Co., Paris;

MENDELSSOHN & Co., Berlin.

PRINCE & WHITELY,

No. 64 Broadway, New York.

(Branch Office, 180 Fifth Avenue.)

All classes of Railway and Mining Stocks bought and sold on Commission.

Private telegraph-wires to Philadelphia, Wilmington, Baltimore, Washington, Boston, Bridgeport, and New Haven.

A. P. TURNER & CO.,

207 WALNUT PLACE, PHILADELPHIA,

DEALERS IN RAILWAY BONDS.

Orders executed at all the exchanges. Correspondence solicited.

Johns Hopkins University,

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

Programmes of the courses offered to University students for the next academic year may be obtained on application.

A General Index to the Nation,

From July, 1865, to September, 1880.

Net price (no trade discount), \$2 50. Purchasers will please remit with order. Address Publisher of the Nation, Fox 794, New York, or Q. P. INDEX, Bangor, Maine.

Printed by the Evening Post Job Printing Office, N. Y.

